arXiv:1207.7086v1 [hep-th] 30 Jul 2012

M-Horizons

J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos

Department of Mathematics
King's College London
Strand
London WC2R 2LS, UK

Abstract

We solve the Killing spinor equations and determine the near horizon geometries of M-theory that preserve at least one supersymmetry. The M-horizon spatial sections are 9-dimensional manifolds with a $Spin(7)$ structure restricted by geometric constraints which we give explicitly. We also provide an alternative characterization of the solutions of the Killing spinor equation, utilizing the compactness of the horizon section and the field equations, by proving a Lichnerowicz type of theorem which implies that the zero modes of a Dirac operator coupled to 4-form fluxes are Killing spinors. We use this, and the maximum principle, to solve the field equations of the theory for some special cases and present some examples.

1 Introduction

Most of the supergravity solutions that have widespread applications in strings and M-theory, such as branes and black holes, admit stationary time-like Killing vector fields which become null at a hypersurface, ie exhibit Killing horizons. For extreme branes [1] and black holes, a suitable geometry can be defined near the Killing horizons, "the near horizon geometry," that is also a solution of the supergravity field equations. Such near horizon geometries exhibit additional symmetries to those of the original brane and black hole spacetimes and they have been the focus of intense investigations in the context of AdS/CFT [2] and black hole thermodynamics.

Under certain regularity assumptions, one can adapt Eddington-Finkelstein type of coordinates near every Killing horizon [13], [14]. In these coordinates and in the near horizon limit, the metric and fluxes of brane and black hole solutions take a particularly simple form. As a result, it is more straightforward to construct the near horizon geometries from those of brane and black hole spacetimes. Because of this, the near horizon geometries can also be used to provide evidence for the existence of new solutions and explore uniqueness theorems for black hole and brane solutions in diverse dimensions [3]-[12].

The search for near horizon geometries in supergravity theories has been facilitated by the additional assumption that they preserve at least one supersymmetry. Using this, a systematic investigation of such solutions can be made, following the solution of the problem for the simple 5-dimensional supergravity in [15] and the subsequent construction of non-spherical black hole solutions, the black rings in [16]. The topology, geometry and fractions of supersymmetry preserved by the horizons of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $d = 4$, $(1, 0)$ $d = 6$ and heterotic supergravities have been determined [18, 19, 20], respectively. Moreover those horizons that preserve at least half of the supersymmetry have been classified up to a local isometry. These results have followed the solution of the Killing spinor equations (KSEs) of these theories for backgrounds preserving any number of supersymmetries [23, 24, 25, 26]. In addition, the topology and geometry of IIB horizons with 5-form flux has been identified in [22] and that of static M-horizons in [21]. In these two cases, it has been assumed that the solutions preserve at least one supersymmetry. Again the solution of the KSEs of IIB [27] and 11-d supergravity [28, 29] for backgrounds preserving one supersymmetry has been utilized. However all our calculations rely on the spinorial geometry technique of [29]. It is not known how to identify all the fractions of supersymmetry preserved by IIB and M-horizons.

In this paper, we solve the KSEs of M-horizons preserving at least one supersymmetry extending the results for static horizons in [21]. For this, we identify the black hole stationary Killing vector field with the Killing vector field of backgrounds preserving one supersymmetry constructed as a Killing spinor bilinear. We shall find that the horizon spatial sections $\mathcal{S}$ admit a $Spin(7)$ structure which satisfies some geometric constraints given in either (A.36) or (A.44). Moreover we show some of the fluxes are expressed in terms of the geometry but some others remain unrestricted by the KSEs. The full solution of the KSEs can be found in appendix A and it is expressed in a gauge where there is a preferred direction[1] in the tangent space of $\mathcal{S}$.

---

[1] Such a direction is always attained as $\mathcal{S}$ is 9-dimensional, the Euler number vanishes, and so it admits

We also give a covariant description of the solution to the KSE by proving a Lichnerowicz type of theorem. The KSE of 11-dimensional supergravity is a parallel transport equation with respect to the supercovariant connection $\mathcal{D}$ associated with the gravitino supersymmetry transformation. It is apparent that every solution of the KSE is also a solution of the Dirac equation associated with $\mathcal{D}$ which exhibits a coupling to the 4-form field strength. Using the compactness of the spatial horizon sections and the field equations of the theory, we shall demonstrate that every zero mode of the Dirac equation on the horizon section gives rise to a parallel and so Killing spinor.

To find examples of near horizon geometries, one has to also solve the field equations and Bianchi identities of the theory which are not implied as integrability conditions of KSEs. In many theories of interest, like heterotic, the former are solved or significantly simplified by using the maximum principle utilizing a scalar on the spatial horizon sections that is constructed from the data of the problem. It is not apparent that all M-horizon geometries can be found in this way. Nevertheless, we explore some special cases relying on the maximum principle to solve or simplify the field equations. In particular, we focus on magnetic horizons and give some explicit results. In addition, we show that all heterotic horizons can be lifted to M-horizons. This class of M-horizons exhibits a supersymmetry enhancement, ie it preserves at least 2 supersymmetries, which is a consequence of a similar property for heterotic horizons.

This paper is organized as follows. In section two, we describe the near horizon fields, state our notation and give the field equations of 11-d supergravity. In section 3, we solve the KSEs. Part of the results of this section are summarized in appendix A. In section 4, we prove the Lichnerowicz type of theorem. Again some of the computations for this are presented in appendices B and C. In section 5, we explore the magnetic horizons and give some examples. In section 6, we also describe the lifting of heterotic horizons to M-theory horizons, and in section 7 we give our conclusions. In appendix D, we solve the KSEs of an example presented in section 5.

2 Near Horizon Geometry

2.1 Near horizon fields

A straightforward adaptation of the analysis in [13], [14] gives that the metric of the near M-horizon geometries can be written as

$$ds^2 \;=\; 2\mathbf{e}^+\mathbf{e}^- + \delta_{ij}\mathbf{e}^i\mathbf{e}^j = 2du(dr + rh - \frac{1}{2}r^2\Delta du) + g_{IJ}dy^I dy^J \;, \tag{2.1}$$

where we have introduced the frame

$$\mathbf{e}^+ = du \;, \quad \mathbf{e}^- = dr + rh - \frac{1}{2}r^2\Delta du \;, \quad \mathbf{e}^i = e^i{}_J dy^J \;; \quad g_{IJ} = \delta_{ij}e^i{}_I e^j{}_J \;, \tag{2.2}$$

the dependence on the coordinates r, u is given explicitly, and $h = h_i\mathbf{e}^i, \Delta$ and e^i_I depend only on the rest of the coordinates y. We choose the frame indices $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, \sharp$

---

an everywhere non-vanishing vector field.

and we follow the conventions of [17]. Observe that the Killing vector field ∂_u is time-like everywhere as $\Delta \geq 0$ and becomes null at $r = 0$. The near horizon section $\mathcal{S}$ is the co-dimension 2 subspace given by $r = u = 0$ equipped with the metric

$$ds^2(\mathcal{S}) = g_{IJ} dy^I dy^J \ , \tag{2.3}$$

and it is assumed to be compact connected without boundary. The near horizon metric (2.1) has an additional isometry to ∂_u, associated with the scaling transformation $r \to \ell r$ $u \to \ell^{-1} u$, which may not be extended beyond the near horizon limit.

Now let us turn to the 3-form gauge potential C of the M-horizons. Using the extremality condition $C_{-ij} = 0$ and that the field strength $F = dC$ must must be invariant under both the stationary and scaling isometries of the near horizon geometries, the most general form of C is

$$C = r\mathbf{e}^+ \wedge B + \mathbf{e}^+ \wedge \mathbf{e}^- \wedge A + G \ , \tag{2.4}$$

where A, B, G are u, r-independent 1-, 2- and 3-forms on $\mathcal{S}$, respectively. Setting[2]

$$Y = -B + d_h A \ , \tag{2.5}$$

one obtains

$$F = \mathbf{e}^+ \wedge \mathbf{e}^- \wedge Y + r\mathbf{e}^+ \wedge d_h Y + X \ , \tag{2.6}$$

where $Y \in \Lambda^2(\mathcal{S})$, $X \in \Lambda^4(\mathcal{S})$ are u, r-independent two and four forms, respectively. The remaining condition imposed by the Bianchi identity is

$$dX = 0 \ . \tag{2.7}$$

To summarize, the metric and 4-form field strength of M-horizons can be expressed as in (2.1) and (2.6), respectively.

2.2 Field Equations

The field equations of 11-dimensional supergravity [30] for M-horizons decompose along the light-cone and spatial horizon section $\mathcal{S}$ directions. The field equation of the 3-form gauge potential is

$$d \star_{11} F - \frac{1}{2} F \wedge F = 0 \ , \tag{2.8}$$

where $\star_{11}$ is the Hodge star operation of 11-dimensional spacetime. These can be decomposed as

$$- \star_9 d_h Y - h \wedge \star_9 X + d \star_9 X = Y \wedge X \ , \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$-d \star_9 Y = \frac{1}{2} X \wedge X \ , \tag{2.10}$$

---

[2] If L is a k-form, then $d_h L = dL - h \wedge L$.

where $\star_9$ is the Hodge star operation on $\mathcal{S}$, spacetime volume form is chosen as $\epsilon_{11} = \mathbf{e}^+ \wedge \mathbf{e}^- \wedge \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the volume form of $\mathcal{S}$. Equivalently, in components, one has

$$\tilde{\nabla}^i X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + 3\tilde{\nabla}_{[\ell_1} Y_{\ell_2\ell_3]} = 3h_{[\ell_1} Y_{\ell_2\ell_3]} + h^i X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} - \frac{1}{48}\epsilon_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}{}^{q_1q_2q_3q_4q_5q_6} Y_{q_1q_2} X_{q_3q_4q_5q_6} \;, \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$\tilde{\nabla}^j Y_{ji} - \frac{1}{1152}\epsilon_i{}^{q_1q_2q_3q_4q_5q_6q_7q_8} X_{q_1q_2q_3q_4} X_{q_5q_6q_7q_8} = 0 \;, \tag{2.12}$$

where $\tilde{\nabla}$ is the Levi-Civita connection of the metric on the near horizon section $\mathcal{S}$.

The Einstein equation is

$$R_{MN} = \frac{1}{12} F_{ML_1L_2L_3} F_N{}^{L_1L_2L_3} - \frac{1}{144} g_{MN} F_{L_1L_2L_3L_4} F^{L_1L_2L_3L_4} \;. \tag{2.13}$$

This decomposes into a number of components. In particular along $\mathcal{S}$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_{ij} + \tilde{\nabla}_{(i} h_{j)} - \frac{1}{2} h_i h_j &= -\frac{1}{2} Y_{i\ell} Y_j{}^{\ell} + \frac{1}{12} X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} X_j{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \\ &+ \delta_{ij}\left(\frac{1}{12} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} Y^{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{1}{144} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\right) \;, \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where $\tilde{R}_{ij}$ is the Ricci tensor of $\mathcal{S}$. The $+-$ component of the Einstein equation gives

$$\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i = 2\Delta + h^2 - \frac{1}{3} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} Y^{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{1}{72} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \;. \tag{2.15}$$

Similarly, the $++$ and $+i$ components of the Einstein equation can be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\nabla}^i\tilde{\nabla}_i \Delta - \frac{3}{2} h^i \tilde{\nabla}_i \Delta - \frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{\nabla}^i h_i + \Delta h^2 + \frac{1}{4} dh_{ij} dh^{ij} = \frac{1}{12} (d_h Y)_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} (d_h Y)^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \;, \tag{2.16}$$

and

$$-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\nabla}^j dh_{ji} + h^j (dh)_{ji} - \tilde{\nabla}_i \Delta + \Delta h_i = \frac{1}{12} X_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} (d_h Y)_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} - \frac{1}{4} (d_h Y)_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} \;, \tag{2.17}$$

respectively. Although we have included the $++$ and the $+i$ components of the Einstein equations for completeness, it is straightforward to show that both (2.16) and (2.17) hold as a consequence of (2.7), the 3-form field equations (2.9) and (2.10) and the components of the Einstein equation in (2.14) and (2.15). This does not make use of supersymmetry, or any assumptions on the topology of $\mathcal{S}$. Hence, the conditions on Δ, h, Y and X simplify to (2.7), (2.9), (2.10), (2.14) and (2.15).

3 Killing spinor equations

The KSE of 11-dimensional supergravity is

$$\nabla_M\epsilon + \bigg(-\frac{1}{288}\Gamma_M{}^{L_1L_2L_3L_4}F_{L_1L_2L_3L_4} + \frac{1}{36}F_{ML_1L_2L_3}\Gamma^{L_1L_2L_3}\bigg)\epsilon = 0 \ , \tag{3.1}$$

where ∇ is the spacetime Levi-Civita connection. The KSE can be decomposed along the light-cone and $\mathcal{S}$ directions, as in the decomposition of the field equations. Before we proceed with the analysis, the non-vanishing components of the spin connection for the metric (2.1) are

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{+,+-} &= -r\Delta, \quad \Omega_{+,+i} = \frac{1}{2}r^2(\Delta h_i - \partial_i\Delta), \quad \Omega_{+,-i} = -\frac{1}{2}h_i, \quad \Omega_{+,ij} = -\frac{1}{2}r(dh)_{ij} \ , \\ \Omega_{-,+i} &= -\frac{1}{2}h_i \ , \quad \Omega_{i,+-} = \frac{1}{2}h_i, \quad \Omega_{i,+j} = -\frac{1}{2}r(dh)_{ij}, \qquad \Omega_{i,jk} = \tilde{\Omega}_{i,jk} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}_{i,jk}$ is the spin connection of the horizon section $\mathcal{S}$.

To solve the KSEs for M-horizons, we shall first demonstrate that they can be integrated along the light-cone directions. Then, we shall assume that the stationary Killing vector field ∂_u is identified with the vector Killing spinor bi-linear of backgrounds preserving one supersymmetry. This leads to a simplification of the KSEs along the horizon section $\mathcal{S}$ which we solve using spinorial geometry [29]. For the analysis, we use the spinor conventions and the "null" spinor basis of Appendix A in [17].

3.1 Integrability of light-cone directions

To solve the KSEs along the light-cone directions, we set

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_+ + \epsilon_- \ , \quad \Gamma_\pm\epsilon_\pm = 0 \ . \tag{3.3}$$

Then after some computation, we find that

$$\epsilon_+ = \eta_+, \qquad \epsilon_- = \eta_- + r\Gamma_-\Theta_+\eta_+ \ , \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\eta_+ = \phi_+ + u\Gamma_+\Theta_-\phi_-, \qquad \eta_- = \phi_- \ , \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$\Theta_\pm = \bigg(\frac{1}{4}h_i\Gamma^i + \frac{1}{288}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \pm \frac{1}{12}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2}\bigg) \ , \tag{3.6}$$

and $\phi_\pm = \phi_\pm(y)$ do not depend on r or u.

Furthermore, the $+$ and $-$ components of the KSE impose the following algebraic conditions on the Killing spinors

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta-\frac{1}{8}dh_{ij}\Gamma^{ij}+\frac{1}{72}d_hY_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\\&+\;2\big(\frac{1}{4}h_i\Gamma^i-\frac{1}{288}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}+\frac{1}{12}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2}\big)\Theta_+\Big)\phi_+=0\;,\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

$$\Big(\frac{1}{4}\Delta h_i\Gamma^i-\frac{1}{4}\partial_i\Delta\Gamma^i+\big(-\frac{1}{8}dh_{ij}\Gamma^{ij}-\frac{1}{24}d_hY_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\big)\,\Theta_+\Big)\phi_+=0\;,\tag{3.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Delta-\frac{1}{8}dh_{ij}\Gamma^{ij}-\frac{1}{72}d_hY_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\\&-\;2\Theta_-\big(-\frac{1}{4}h_j\Gamma^j+\frac{1}{288}X_{n_1n_2n_3n_4}\Gamma^{n_1n_2n_3n_4}+\frac{1}{12}Y_{n_1n_2}\Gamma^{n_1n_2}\big)\Big)\Theta_-\phi_-=0\;,\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(-\frac{1}{4}\Delta h_i\Gamma^i+\frac{1}{4}\partial_i\Delta\Gamma^i+\big(-\frac{1}{8}dh_{ij}\Gamma^{ij}+\frac{1}{24}d_hY_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\big)\\&\big(-\frac{1}{4}h_n\Gamma^n+\frac{1}{288}X_{n_1n_2n_3n_4}\Gamma^{n_1n_2n_3n_4}+\frac{1}{12}Y_{n_1n_2}\Gamma^{n_1n_2}\big)\Big)\Theta_-\phi_-=0\;,\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta-\frac{1}{8}dh_{ij}\Gamma^{ij}+\frac{1}{24}d_hY_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\\&+\;2\big(-\frac{1}{4}h_n\Gamma^n+\frac{1}{288}X_{n_1n_2n_3n_4}\Gamma^{n_1n_2n_3n_4}+\frac{1}{12}Y_{n_1n_2}\Gamma^{n_1n_2}\big)\Theta_-\Big)\phi_-=0\;.\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

Since we have separated the light-cone directions from the rest, the remaining KSEs have manifest $Spin(9)\subset Spin(10,1)$ local gauge invariance.

3.2 Horizons with one supersymmetry

3.2.1 Stationary Killing vector field and spinor bilinears

The associated 1-form of the stationary Killing vector field ∂_u of M-horizon geometries is

$$V=\mathbf{e}^--\frac{1}{2}r^2\Delta\mathbf{e}^+\;,\tag{3.12}$$

as expressed in the basis (2.2). For backgrounds preserving at least one supersymmetry, the spacetime 1-form constructed as a Killing spinor bilinear is identified with

$$W=\langle B\epsilon^*,\Gamma_A\epsilon\rangle\,\mathbf{e}^A\;.\tag{3.13}$$

For supersymmetric black holes[3], $V = W$. To find the conditions implied by this identification, we shall use the local $Spin(9)$ gauge invariance of the KSE, after solving along the light-cone directions, to choose $\phi_\pm$ and identify W. For this observe that both $\phi_\pm$ are Majorana $Spin(9)$ spinors. Moreover it is well known that $Spin(9)$ acts transitively on the S^{15} sphere in the Majorana representation and the isotropy group is $Spin(7)$, ie $Spin(9)/Spin(7) = S^{15}$. Using this, one can orient the spinor ϕ_- along any direction with a $Spin(9)$ transformation. As a result, we can choose

$$\phi_- = w(e_5 + e_{12345}) \ , \tag{3.14}$$

where w is a real function. Next, on comparing the components of W with those of V in the basis (2.2), we require that

$$W_+|_{r=0} = 0 \ , \tag{3.15}$$

which in turn imposes the condition $w = 0$. So we conclude that

$$\phi_- = 0 \ . \tag{3.16}$$

As $\phi_- = 0$ is invariant under $Spin(9)$, the $Spin(9)$ gauge transformations can be used again to choose ϕ_+. In particular, without loss of generality, one can set

$$\phi_+ = g(1 + e_{1234}) \ , \tag{3.17}$$

for some real r, u-independent function g. Note then that

$$W_- = -2\sqrt{2} g^2 \ . \tag{3.18}$$

As we require that $V_- = 1$, this implies that g is constant. For convenience, we set $g = 1$, so that

$$\phi_+ = 1 + e_{1234} \ . \tag{3.19}$$

To proceed, note that as a consequence of (3.4) and (3.5), it follows that

$$\epsilon = \phi_+ + r\Gamma_- \zeta \ , \quad \zeta \equiv \Theta_+ \phi_+ \ . \tag{3.20}$$

Next, the condition $W_i = 0$ implies that

$$\langle \phi_+, \Gamma_i \zeta \rangle = 0 \ , \tag{3.21}$$

or equivalently

$$h_i \langle \phi_+, \phi_+ \rangle + \frac{2}{3} Y_{i\ell} \langle \phi_+, \Gamma^\ell \phi_+ \rangle + \frac{1}{72} \langle \phi_+, \Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 \ell_4} X_{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 \ell_4} \phi_+ \rangle = 0 \ . \tag{3.22}$$

The remaining condition imposed by comparing V and W is obtained from $V_+ = W_+$ as

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \phi_+, \phi_+ \rangle \Delta = 2 \langle \zeta, \zeta \rangle \ . \tag{3.23}$$

This concludes the analysis of the conditions which arise from the identification of the stationary Killing vector field with that constructed as a Killing spinor bilinear.

---

[3] The identification of V with W is up to a constant scale chosen at convenience.

3.2.2 KSEs along $\mathcal{S}$

The KSEs along the spatial horizon section $\mathcal{S}$ can be written as

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi_+ + \Big(-\frac{1}{4}h_i - \frac{1}{288}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{36}X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{24}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{1}{6}Y_{ij}\Gamma^j \Big)\phi_+ = 0 \ , \tag{3.24}$$

and

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i\zeta + \Big(-\frac{1}{2}h_i + \frac{1}{4}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell}h_\ell - \frac{1}{24}X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{8}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} \Big)\zeta + \Big(\frac{1}{4}\Delta\Gamma_i - \frac{1}{16}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2}dh_{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{3}{8}dh_{i\ell}\Gamma^\ell - \frac{1}{48}d_hY_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma_i \Big)\phi_+ = 0 \ . \tag{3.25}$$

As we shall show (3.25) is not an independent condition.

3.3 Solution of KSEs

3.3.1 Preliminaries

Before we proceed to describe the solution to the KSEs, it is instructive to specify the independent ones. Since $\phi_- = 0$, the conditions (3.9) to (3.11) are automatically satisfied. Moreover, the conditions (3.7) and (3.8) are implied by (3.24) and (3.25) as well as the conditions obtained from the identification $V = W$ in section 3.2.1. In particular, the elimination of (3.7) and (3.8) as independent conditions follows without the use of field equations and Bianchi identities. The details of this analysis are presented in Appendix A.

Further simplification is possible provided that the field equations and the Bianchi identities are used as well. In particular, one can show that (3.25) is implied by (3.24), after using the Bianchi identity $dX = 0$ (2.7), the 3-form gauge potential field equations (2.9) and (2.10), and the components of the Einstein equations on $\mathcal{S}$. The details of this are presented in Appendix B.

Furthermore, the $+-$ component of the Einstein equation (2.15) is implied by supersymmetry. This component has not been used to rewrite any of the conditions involving the Killing spinor. It is straightforward to show that (2.15) is obtained by contracting (B.1) with Γ^i, and then using (2.7), (2.9) and (2.10).

Next, observe that if $\phi = \phi_+$ satisfies (3.24), then it follows that

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i\langle\phi,\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}h_i\langle\phi,\phi\rangle + \frac{1}{3}Y_{i\ell}\langle\phi,\Gamma^\ell\phi\rangle + \frac{1}{144}\langle\phi,\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\phi\rangle \ . \tag{3.26}$$

Hence $\langle\phi,\phi\rangle$ is constant iff

$$h_i\langle\phi,\phi\rangle + \frac{2}{3}Y_{i\ell}\langle\phi,\Gamma^\ell\phi\rangle + \frac{1}{72}\langle\phi,\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\phi\rangle = 0 \ . \tag{3.27}$$

This condition is identical to (3.22) which has been derived from the identification $V = W$ in section 3.2.1. Hence it follows that provided the Bianchi identity (2.7) and bosonic field equations (2.9), (2.10) and (2.14) hold, the conditions imposed by supersymmetry reduce to (3.24) and (3.23), where ζ and the Killing spinor ϵ are given in (3.20).

We remark that the condition $\langle\phi, \phi\rangle = \text{const}$, which as we have previously observed arises from the identification of the Killing vectors $V = W$ in section 3.2.1, can also be derived. In particular one can take the divergence of (3.26) and then use (3.24), (2.15) to express $\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i$ in terms of h, Y and X, and (2.10) to rewrite $\tilde{\nabla}^i Y_{ij}$ in terms of $X \wedge X$. One then obtains the condition

$$\tilde{\nabla}^i \tilde{\nabla}_i \langle\phi, \phi\rangle - 2h^i \tilde{\nabla}_i \langle\phi, \phi\rangle = 0 \ . \tag{3.28}$$

On applying the maximum principle, it follows that $\langle\phi, \phi\rangle = \text{const}$.

3.3.2 Solution of the linear system

As we have mentioned there are several ways to choose the independent KSEs to solve. Perhaps the most straightforward case is to consider the KSEs (3.24) and (3.25) together with $\phi_+ = 1 + e_{1234}$, which arises from the identification $V = W$ in section 3.2.1, and to use the remaining $Spin(7)$ gauge invariance to choose ζ in (3.20). This can be done as follows. The identification $W = V$ implies that $W_i = 0$, which in turn can be written as (3.21). This implies that ζ must be a linear combination of $i(1 - e_{1234})$ and e_{ij}, ie ζ lies in the **7** representation of $Spin(7)$. In such a case, a $Spin(7)$ transformation can be used, which leaves $1 + e_{1234}$ invariant, such that without loss of generality one can set

$$\zeta = \Theta_+ \phi_+ = i\Phi(1 - e_{1234}) \ , \tag{3.29}$$

for some Φ a real function on $\mathcal{S}$. Thus the Killing spinor is

$$\epsilon = 1 + e_{1234} + ir\Phi(1 - e_{1234}) \ . \tag{3.30}$$

Using the above gauge, the KSEs (3.24) and (3.25) can be expressed as a linear system which has been presented in appendix A. The linear system can be solved to express some of the fluxes in terms of the geometry and find the conditions on the geometry of $\mathcal{S}$ imposed by supersymmetry. There are two cases to consider. First suppose that as some patch $\Delta \neq 0$. In such a case, one has from (3.23) that

$$\Delta = 4\Phi^2 \ . \tag{3.31}$$

The solution of the linear system is explicitly given in appendix A. The solution of the system for $\Delta = 0$ is also given in appendix A. In both cases, not all fluxes of the theory are determined in terms of the geometry. In particular, the (2,2) and traceless part of X is not determined by the KSEs.

3.3.3 Topology and Geometry of horizon sections

The spatial horizon section $\mathcal{S}$ admits a $Spin(7)$ structure. This is because the parallel transport equation (3.24) implies that there is a nowhere vanishing spinor ϕ_+ on $\mathcal{S}$.

However, this does not impose a topological condition on $\mathcal{S}$ as every 9-dimensional spin manifold admits a $Spin(7)$ structure. To see this, the structure group of $\mathcal{S}$ will reduce to $Spin(7)$ iff the the bundle $P\times_{Spin(9)} Spin(9)/Spin(7)$ with fibre $Spin(9)/Spin(7)$ admits a section, where P is the principal spin bundle over $\mathcal{S}$. The principal topological obstructions for the existence of such sections lie in $H^k(\mathcal{S},\pi_{k-1}(Spin(9)/Spin(7)))$. But $Spin(9)/Spin(7)=S^{15}$ and so $\pi_k(Spin(9)/Spin(7))=0$ for $k<15$. As a result all obstructions vanish.

Observe also that if $\Delta\neq 0$ everywhere on $\mathcal{S}$, then there is an additional nowhere vanishing spinor on $\mathcal{S}$ and its structure group reduces to $SU(4)$. Unlike the previous case, there are topological obstructions to reducing the structure group of $\mathcal{S}$ to $SU(4)$ the first lying in $H^6(\mathcal{S},\mathbb{Z})$. But $\Delta\neq 0$ is an additional condition and it does not always follow from the KSEs.

The only geometric condition on $\mathcal{S}$ linear in the spin connection which follows from the solution of the linear system is (A.36). As has been mentioned in appendix A, there are additional conditions on the geometry which however are quadratic in the spin connection and as a result resemble integrability conditions.

Although the linear system associated with the KSEs can be solved and the geometric conditions on the horizon section $\mathcal{S}$ can be identified, the rather involved form of the resulting equations which express the fluxes in terms of the geometry do not yield a manageable expression after substitution into the field equations[4]. In addition, the choice of gauge we have made leads to a distinguished direction $\mathbf{e}^\sharp$ on $\mathcal{S}$. This works well for the M-horizons which manifestly exhibit such a direction[5], like those for example that are associated with either IIA or heterotic horizons. Otherwise the existence of such a direction breaks the manifest covariance of the horizons and it is a hindrance to construct solutions.

To make further progress, we shall recast the KSEs in a different form using a Dirac operator. In this formulation the $\mathbf{e}^\sharp$ direction is not manifest. We shall also present some examples.

4 Horizon Dirac Equation and a Lichnerowicz Theorem

4.1 A horizon Dirac Equation

Given the gravitino KSE in a supergravity theory which is a parallel transport equation for the supercovariant connection, $\mathcal{D}_A\epsilon=0$, one can construct a "supergravity Dirac equation" as $\Gamma^A\mathcal{D}_A\epsilon=0$. This can be adapted to the near horizon geometries. In particular, for the "horizon gravitino KSE" on $\mathcal{S}$ (3.24), which for convenience can be written as

---

[4] The same applies when one attempts to use the solutions of the KSEs to apply the maximum principle on either Δ or h^2. In any case, it is not apparent that all M-horizons have either Δ or h^2 constant that an application of the maximum principle would imply. In fact, we know that there are static horizons [21] with h^2 non-constant given by the warped AdS_2 solutions of [32].

[5] Topologically, there is always such a direction on a 9-dimensional manifold as its Euler number vanishes. However, geometrically such a direction may not be manifest.

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi + \Psi_i\phi = 0 \ , \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\Psi_i = -\frac{1}{4}h_i - \frac{1}{288}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{36}X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{24}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{1}{6}Y_{ij}\Gamma^j \ , \tag{4.2}$$

one can define the associated "horizon Dirac equation" on $\mathcal{S}$ as

$$\Gamma^i\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi + \Psi\phi = 0 \ , \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$\Psi = \Gamma^i\Psi_i = -\frac{1}{4}h_\ell\Gamma^\ell + \frac{1}{96}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{8}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} \ . \tag{4.4}$$

This Dirac equation, in addition to the Levi-Civita connection, also depends on the fluxes of the supergravity theory restricted on the horizon section $\mathcal{S}$.

4.2 A Lichnerowicz theorem

The horizon Dirac equation (4.3) can be used to give a new characterization of the Killing spinors. Clearly, the gravitino KSE is more restrictive and any solution of the gravitino KSE is also a solution of a Dirac equation. In what follows, we shall explore the converse. In particular, we shall show that under certain conditions the zero modes of the horizon Dirac equation are parallel with respect to the horizon supercovariant derivative (4.1).

Before proceeding with the analysis of the supergravity case, it is useful to recall the Lichnerowicz theorem. On any spin compact manifold N, one can show the equality

$$\int_N \langle\Gamma^i\nabla_i\epsilon, \Gamma^j\nabla_j\epsilon\rangle = \int_N \langle\nabla_i\epsilon, \nabla^i\epsilon\rangle + \int_N \frac{R}{4}\langle\epsilon,\epsilon\rangle \ , \tag{4.5}$$

where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection, $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the Dirac inner product and R is the Ricci scalar. Clearly if $R > 0$, the Dirac operator has no zero modes. Moreover, if $R = 0$, then the zero modes of the Dirac operator are parallel with respect to the Levi-Civita connection.

This theorem can be generalized for M-horizons with the standard Dirac operator replaced with the horizon Dirac operator in (4.3) and the Levi-Civita covariant derivative replaced with that of the horizon supercovariant derivative (4.1). For this, let ϕ be a Majorana *Spin*(9) spinor and consider

$$\mathcal{I} = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \langle\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi + \Psi_i\phi, \tilde{\nabla}^i\phi + \Psi^i\phi\rangle - \int_{\mathcal{S}} \langle\Gamma^i\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi + \Psi\phi, \Gamma^j\tilde{\nabla}_j\phi + \Psi\phi\rangle \ , \tag{4.6}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the Dirac inner product of *Spin*(9) which in turn is identified with the standard Hermitian inner product on $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{C}^4)$. Observe that $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is positive definite and under this inner product the *Spin*(9) gamma matrices are Hermitian.

We assume that $\mathcal{S}$ is compact and without boundary, and that ϕ is globally well-defined and smooth on $\mathcal{S}$. Then, on integrating by parts, one can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I} &= \int_{\mathcal{S}} \langle \phi, (\Psi^{i\dagger} - \Psi^i)\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi + (\Psi_i^\dagger \Psi^i - \Psi^\dagger\Psi)\phi + \Gamma^{ij}\tilde{\nabla}_i\tilde{\nabla}_j\phi \\ &+ (\Gamma^i\tilde{\nabla}_i\Psi - (\tilde{\nabla}^i\Psi_i))\phi + (\Gamma^i\Psi - \Psi\Gamma^i)\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi\rangle \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Next, evaluating the RHS of the above equation using the Bianchi identity of X (2.7), the field equation of the 4-form field strength (2.9) and (2.10), the Einstein equations along $\mathcal{S}$ (2.14) and taking $\langle\phi,\phi\rangle = \text{const}^6$, one finds that

$$\mathcal{I} = \text{Re}\,\Bigg(\int_{\mathcal{S}} \langle \phi, \big(\frac{1}{2}h_\ell\Gamma^\ell - \frac{1}{144}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{6}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2}\big)(\Gamma^i\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi + \Psi\phi)\rangle\Bigg) \ . \tag{4.8}$$

Further details of this computation are given in Appendix C. On comparing (4.8) with (4.6), one immediately finds that if ϕ is a solution of the horizon Dirac equation, then ϕ is a solution of the horizon gravitino KSE (4.1).

Clearly, the above theorem gives a different characterization of supersymmetric horizons. In particular, if one assumes the Bianchi identity for X (2.7), the 4-form field equations (2.9) and (2.10), and the Einstein equations along $\mathcal{S}$ (2.14) are satisfied, then the remaining conditions imposed by supersymmetry and the identification $V = W$ in section 3.2.1 are (3.23) and the Dirac equation (4.3) with $\phi = 1 + e_{1234}$. Thus under these conditions the horizon KSE (4.1) can be replaced by the horizon Dirac equation. We remark that the only condition involving Δ is (3.23), which therefore defines Δ in terms of the other near-horizon data.

4.3 Solution of horizon Dirac Equation

As we have demonstrated in the previous section instead of solving the KSEs, it suffices to solve the the condition (3.23) and the Dirac equation (4.3) for $\phi = 1+e_{1234}$. The spinor $\phi = 1 + e_{1234}$ defines a *Spin*(7) structure on $\mathcal{S}$ with *Spin*(7) fundamental forms

$$\mathbf{e}^\sharp \ , \qquad \psi = \frac{1}{2}(\chi + \bar{\chi}) - \frac{1}{2}\omega\wedge\omega \ , \tag{4.9}$$

where χ is a $(4,0)$ form, and ω is an (almost) Hermitian form, see (A.3). *Spin*(7) acts with the $\mathbf{1}\oplus\mathbf{8}$ representation on the typical fibre of $T\mathcal{S}$, and $\mathbf{e}^\sharp$ is along the trivial representation while ψ is the fundamental *Spin*(7) form in the eight directions transverse to $\mathbf{e}^\sharp$.

The solution of the linear system obtained from (4.3) with $\phi = 1+e_{1234}$ can be written as

$$h = i_{e_\sharp}Z + \frac{1}{2}\theta_\psi - \star_9(X\wedge\psi) - \frac{3}{2}(\star_9 d \star_9 \mathbf{e}^\sharp)\mathbf{e}^\sharp \ , \tag{4.10}$$

---

[6] This imposes a condition on the spinors which is not usual in the context of a Lichnerowicz theorem. However, it can be shown that from the KSEs side it always holds irrespective of the identification of $V = W$. Alternatively, the $\langle\phi,\phi\rangle = \text{const}$ condition from the Dirac side can be removed provided one in addition imposes $\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i = 0$ on the geometry.

and

$$Z^{\mathbf{7}} = i_\psi \left(\frac{1}{48} \star_9 d\psi - \frac{1}{12} X \right)^{\mathbf{7}} , \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$Z = Y - d\mathbf{e}^\sharp, \qquad \theta_\psi = \star_9 \big(\psi \wedge \star_9 d\psi \big) , \tag{4.12}$$

ie θ_ψ is the Lee form of ψ. In addition we have used that if $B \in \Lambda^4(\mathcal{S})$ is a 4-form, then $i_\psi B \in \Lambda^2(\mathcal{S})$ with

$$(i_\psi B)_{ij} = B_{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 [i} \psi^{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3}{}_{j]} , \tag{4.13}$$

and that the superscript $\mathbf{7}$ denotes a projection on the 7-dimensional irreducible representation of $Spin(7)$ in the directions orthogonal to $\mathbf{e}^\sharp$.

It is clear that the solution of the horizon Dirac equation can be cast in a more compact form than the solution to the KSEs. However now the field equations have a more significant role in the construction of solutions. Nevertheless even though the field equations are second order, when they are restricted on the near horizon geometries they take a rather manageable form, which we shall use to construct solutions.

5 Solutions

5.1 Maximum principle

In many supergravity theories, the field equations for near horizon geometries are solved using the maximum principle on either Δ or h^2. As a consequence, the horizons have either Δ or h^2 constant. As we have already mentioned, it is known that there are M-horizons for which h^2 is not constant. Nevertheless, it is instructive to seek conditions such that the maximum principle applies to either of the two scalars. To make the application of the maximum principle tangible on Δ or h^2, one has to construct a second order operator acting on these two functions on $\mathcal{S}$. A direct application of the field equations of the theory reveals that

$$\tilde{\nabla}^2 \Delta = 3 h^i \partial_i \Delta + 2\Delta^2 - \Delta h^2 - \frac{1}{3} \Delta Y^2 - \frac{1}{72} \Delta X^2 - \frac{1}{2} (dh)^2 + \frac{1}{6} (d_h Y)^2 , \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla}^2 h^2 &= 2 \tilde{\nabla}_{(i} h_{j)} \tilde{\nabla}^{(i} h^{j)} + \frac{1}{2} (dh)^2 + 4 \Delta h^2 + h^i \tilde{\nabla}_i h^2 + (h^2)^2 \\ &- \frac{1}{3} h^i X_{i j_1 j_2 j_3} d_h Y^{j_1 j_2 j_3} + h^i d_h Y_{i j_1 j_2} Y^{j_1 j_2} - h^i Y_{ik} h^j Y_j{}^k + \frac{1}{6} h^i X_{i k_1 k_2 k_3} h^j X_j{}^{k_1 k_2 k_3} \\ &+ h^2 \big(\frac{1}{6} Y^2 - \frac{1}{72} X^2 \big) - \frac{2}{3} h^i \tilde{\nabla}_i Y^2 - \frac{1}{36} h^i \tilde{\nabla}_i X^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Observe that the signs of the various terms are indefinite and as a result the maximum principle does not apply. In what follows, we shall make some simplifying assumptions, and together with the solutions of the KSEs we shall bring the above equations into a form which the maximum principle can be applied to.

5.2 Magnetic solutions

5.2.1 The geometry of $\mathcal{S}$

For magnetic solutions, $Y = 0$. In addition, let us take $\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i = 0$. The field equation (2.15) implies that

$$2\Delta + h^2 - \frac{1}{72}X^2 = 0 \ . \tag{5.16}$$

Substituting this into (5.14), one finds

$$\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\nabla}^2\Delta - \frac{3}{2}h^i\tilde{\nabla}_i\Delta = -\Delta h^2 - dh_{ij}dh^{ij} \ . \tag{5.17}$$

Integrating both sides of this equation over $\mathcal{S}$ the contribution from the LHS vanishes. As $\Delta \geq 0$, see (3.23), this implies that both terms on the RHS must also vanish, ie

$$dh = 0 \tag{5.18}$$

and

$$\Delta h = 0 \ . \tag{5.19}$$

For the latter condition, there are two possibilities. If $h = 0$ then (2.17) implies that Δ is constant. However, we shall concentrate on the second case[7], for which $\Delta = 0$.

Next turning to (5.15), one finds that

$$\tilde{\nabla}^2 h^2 + 2h^i\tilde{\nabla}_i h^2 = 2\tilde{\nabla}^{(i}h^{j)}\tilde{\nabla}_{(i}h_{j)} + \frac{1}{12}h^i X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}h^j X_j{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \ . \tag{5.20}$$

An application of the maximum principle implies that h^2 is constant and both terms on the RHS must vanish. Hence, we find that h is covariantly constant on $\mathcal{S}$

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i h_j = 0 \ . \tag{5.21}$$

We take $h^2 \neq 0$, as if $h = 0$ then (2.15) implies $X = 0$ and so $F = 0$. In addition, we find the condition

$$i_h X = 0 \ , \tag{5.22}$$

which together with the Bianchi identity (2.7) implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_h X = 0 \ . \tag{5.23}$$

The necessary and sufficient conditions imposed by supersymmetry are obtained from considering the Dirac equation as described in the previous section. In this case, (3.23) with $\Delta = 0$ implies the algebraic condition

$$\left(h_\ell\Gamma^\ell + \frac{1}{72}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\right)\phi = 0 \ , \tag{5.24}$$

---

[7] Observe that if $\Delta = 0$, then (5.14) is automatically satisfied without other assumptions as a consequence of (A.25).

and the Dirac equation then simplifies to

$$\Gamma^i \tilde{\nabla}_i \phi - h_i \Gamma^i \phi = 0 \ . \tag{5.25}$$

Thus ϕ can be thought of as a spinor coupled to a magnetic gauge potential h.

We remark that these conditions are also sufficient to imply the Einstein equations (2.14), provided that the condition imposed on the Ricci scalar by (2.14) is given. To see this, note that the reasoning used to prove the Lichnerowicz identity set out in Appendix C only makes use of the expression for the Ricci scalar, and hence it follows that the above conditions are sufficient to imply equation (B.3). Then, on substituting the above conditions into (B.3), one obtains the Einstein equations (2.14).

For the near horizon Dirac equation to imply the horizon KSE, one has also to impose the condition $\langle \phi, \phi \rangle = \text{const}$. However in this case, it is not necessary as $\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i = 0$ and the partial integration argument used to prove the Lichnerowicz identity in appendix C goes through without this condition. Nevertheless, one can show that $\langle \phi, \phi \rangle = \text{const}$. To see this, observe that the near horizon Dirac equation (5.25) implies the near horizon KSE (3.24), and after simplifying the latter using (5.24), we get

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i \phi + \big(\frac{1}{4} \Gamma_i{}^{\ell} h_\ell + \frac{1}{24} X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\big)\phi = 0 \ . \tag{5.26}$$

This in turn gives

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i \langle \phi, \phi \rangle = 0 \ , \tag{5.27}$$

and hence, $\langle \phi, \phi \rangle = \text{const}$. Furthermore on contracting (5.26) with h, one obtains

$$h^i \tilde{\nabla}_i \phi = 0 \ . \tag{5.28}$$

Let us summarize the results so far. It is clear that $\mathcal{S}$ is locally a product $\mathcal{S} = S^1 \times M^8$, where S^1 is along the h direction and M^8 is a compact 8-dimensional manifold. Moreover, (5.22) and (5.23) imply that X is a 4-form on M^8. In addition, since ϕ does not depend of the coordinate of S^1, all the KSEs and the field equations reduce to equations on M^8.

Furthermore adapting a local co-ordinate x such that $h = dx$, one finds that the 11-dimensional spacetime metric is

$$ds^2 = ds_3^2 + ds^2(M^8) \ , \tag{5.29}$$

where

$$ds_3^2 = 2du(dr + rdx) + \frac{dx^2}{m^2} \ , \tag{5.30}$$

is the metric on AdS_3, with scalar curvature $R_{AdS_3} = -\frac{3m^2}{2}$, and m is the inverse radius of S^1. The spacetime is a direct product $AdS_3 \times M^8$.

5.2.2 Field and KSEs on M_8

We have shown that locally $\mathcal{S} = S^1 \times M^8$ and that the metric can be locally written as

$$ds^2(\mathcal{S}) = (\mathbf{e}^9)^2 + ds^2(M^8) \ , \quad \mathbf{e}^9 = \frac{dx}{m} \ . \tag{5.31}$$

Thus $h = m\mathbf{e}^9$ and $\text{dvol}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathbf{e}^9 \wedge \text{dvol}(M^8)$

Since the flux X is a 4-form on M^8 it can be decomposed into self-dual and anti-self dual parts as $X = X^+ + X^-$. We also decompose the spinor ϕ as $\phi = \phi^+ + \phi^-$ using the projection[8] $\Gamma^9\phi^\pm = \pm\phi^\pm$. This can be identified with the decomposition of Majorana spinors of $Spin(8)$ into chiral and anti-chiral Majorana-Weyl spinors.

The conditions that we have found on $\mathcal{S}$ imposed by the field and KSEs can now be re-expressed as conditions on M^8. In particular, the field equations and Bianchi identities reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} dX^\pm &= 0, \qquad (X^\pm)_{A_1A_2A_3A_4}(X^\pm)^{A_1A_2A_3A_4} = 36m^2, \\ \tilde{R}^{(8)}_{AB} &= -\frac{m^2}{2}g_{AB} + \frac{1}{12}X_{AN_1N_2N_3}X_B{}^{N_1N_2N_3} \ , \qquad \tilde{R}^{(8)} = 2m^2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

where $\tilde{R}^{(8)}_{AB}$ and $\tilde{R}^{(8)}$ is the Ricci tensor[9] and scalar of M^8, respectively. The necessary and sufficient conditions for supersymmetry are

$$\frac{1}{72}(X^\pm)_{A_1A_2A_3A_4}\Gamma^{A_1A_2A_3A_4}\phi^\pm \pm m\phi^\pm = 0 \ , \tag{5.33}$$

and

$$\Gamma^A\tilde{\nabla}_A\phi^\pm \pm m\phi^\mp = 0 \ . \tag{5.34}$$

Moreover the gravitino equation (3.24) can be written on M_8

$$\tilde{\nabla}_A\phi^\pm \mp \frac{m}{4}\Gamma_A\phi^\mp + \frac{1}{24}X_{AN_1N_2N_3}\Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3}\phi^\mp = 0 \ . \tag{5.35}$$

We have shown that not all conditions in (5.32), (5.33) and (5.34) and (5.35) are independent but it is convenient for the analysis that follows to state them explicitly.

5.2.3 Topology of M^8

As we have mentioned the existence of a parallel spinor on $\mathcal{S}$ would imply that $\mathcal{S}$ admits a nowhere vanishing spinor. This does not impose a priori a topological restriction on $\mathcal{S}$ as all 9-dimensional manifold admit such spinors.

Next let us turn to investigate this question for M^8. The relevant parallel transport equation is (5.35). Again, the existence of a parallel, and so nowhere vanishing, spinor

---

[8] Note that here ± appear as superscripts on spinors, in contrast to subscript ± elsewhere, which denote chirality with respect to Γ_{+-}. Throughout this section, all spinors ϕ satisfy $\Gamma_{+-}\phi = \phi$.

[9] Throughout this section, $A, B = 1, \dots 8$ are indices of M^8 and should not be confused with the spacetime indices in section 2.

$\phi = \phi^+ + \phi^-$ does not impose a priori a topological restriction on M^8 as the rank of the spinor bundle is 16 much larger than the dimension of M^8. However, this conclusion holds provided that both components $\phi^\pm$ of ϕ do not vanish. In fact, they are allowed to vanish at subsets of M^8 but they cannot vanish everywhere. To see this, suppose that ϕ^- vanishes everywhere. In such a case

$$\tilde{\nabla}_A \phi^+ = 0 \tag{5.36}$$

and so M^8 is a holonomy $Spin(7)$ manifold, ie $\mathrm{hol}(\tilde{\nabla}) \subseteq Spin(7)$. In particular, it will be Ricci flat and so the field equations (5.32) cannot be satisfied with $m \neq 0$.

The existence of a non-vanishing Majorana-Weyl spinor on a 8-dimensional manifold imposes a topological restriction, see [31]. In particular, it is required that

$$\pm e - \frac{1}{2} p_2 + \frac{1}{8} p_1^2 = 0 \ , \tag{5.37}$$

where e is the Euler class and p_2 and p_1 are the Pontryagin classes, and the sign depends on the chirality of the non-vanishing spinor. We shall explicitly show that this condition is not satisfied for an example we shall present below.

5.2.4 Geometry of M^8

In order to evaluate the conditions imposed on the geometry of M_8, note that (5.35) implies that

$$\tilde{\nabla}_A f^2 = \frac{m}{2} \langle \phi^+, \Gamma_A \phi^- \rangle + \frac{1}{12} X_{AN_1N_2N_3} \langle \phi^-, \Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3} \phi^+ \rangle \ , \tag{5.38}$$

and on taking the divergence, one obtains

$$\tilde{\nabla}^2 f^2 = m^2 \big(1 - 2f^2\big) \ , \tag{5.39}$$

where we have set $f^2 = \langle \phi^+, \phi^+ \rangle$ and have adopted the convention $\langle \phi^+, \phi^+ \rangle + \langle \phi^-, \phi^- \rangle = 1$. Again, from this equation, we note that $f = 0$ and $f = 1$ are not solutions, ie , there are no solutions for which either ϕ^+ or ϕ^- vanish identically as has been previously observed.

To proceed further, define the (real) 1-form spinor bilinear ξ by

$$\xi_A = \langle \phi^-, \Gamma_A \phi^+ \rangle \ , \tag{5.40}$$

and it will be convenient to note the identities

$$\xi^A \Gamma_A \phi^\pm = \langle \phi^\pm, \phi^\pm \rangle \phi^\mp \ , \tag{5.41}$$

and

$$\xi^2 = f^2 (1 - f^2) \ . \tag{5.42}$$

Next, we use (5.35) to take the covariant derivative of ξ, to obtain

$$\tilde{\nabla}_A \xi_B = -\frac{m}{4} (2f^2 - 1) \delta_{AB} + \frac{1}{24} X_{AN_1N_2N_3} \big(\langle \phi^+, \Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3}{}_B \phi^+ \rangle + \langle \phi^-, \Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3}{}_B \phi^- \rangle \big) . \tag{5.43}$$

Furthermore, note that (5.33) implies that

$$X_{AN_1N_2N_3}\Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3}\phi^\pm = -\frac{1}{4}\Gamma_A{}^{N_1N_2N_3N_4}\phi^\pm \mp 18m\Gamma_A\phi^\pm \ , \tag{5.44}$$

which in turn implies that

$$X_{N_1N_2N_3[A}\langle\phi^\pm, \Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3}{}_{B]}\phi^\pm\rangle = 0 \ . \tag{5.45}$$

On substituting this condition back into (5.43) one finds that

$$d\xi = 0 \ . \tag{5.46}$$

Further useful identities can be obtained by multiplying (5.33) with $\langle\phi^\mp, \phi^\mp\rangle$ and using (5.41) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{72}X_{N_1N_2N_3N_4}\Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3N_4}\xi_B\Gamma^B\phi^\mp \pm m\langle\phi^\mp, \phi^\mp\rangle\phi^\pm = 0 \ . \tag{5.47}$$

On comparing this expression with that obtained by acting on (5.33) with $\xi^B\Gamma_B$, one finds

$$(i_\xi X)_{N_1N_2N_3}\Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3}\phi^\pm = \mp 18m\langle\phi^\pm, \phi^\pm\rangle\phi^\mp \ . \tag{5.48}$$

In addition, on replacing X with $\star_8 X$ and making the appropriate sign changes, using the same reasoning one finds

$$(i_\xi \star_8 X)_{N_1N_2N_3}\Gamma^{N_1N_2N_3}\phi^+ = 0 \ . \tag{5.49}$$

Using these identities, on contracting (5.43) with ξ^B, and making use of the closure of ξ, and (5.42), the condition

$$(2f^2-1)\Big(m\xi + df^2\Big) = 0 \ . \tag{5.50}$$

On taking the norm of this expression one finds

$$(2f^2-1)^2\big(\tilde{\nabla}_A f^2\tilde{\nabla}^A f^2 - m^2f^2(1-f^2)\big) = 0 \ . \tag{5.51}$$

We remark however that $f^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ is not a solution, to see this, contract (5.38) with ξ^A to obtain

$$\xi^A\hat{\nabla}_A f^2 = -mf^2(1-f^2) \ . \tag{5.52}$$

Additional geometric conditions are obtained by defining the (real) 4-form spinor bilinear

$$\hat{\varphi}_{A_1A_2A_3A_4} = \langle\phi^+, \Gamma_{A_1A_2A_3A_4}\phi^+\rangle \ . \tag{5.53}$$

Using (5.35) and (5.33) one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\nabla}^N\hat{\varphi}_{NN_1N_2N_3} &= -\frac{7}{2}m\langle\phi^-, \Gamma_{N_1N_2N_3}\phi^+\rangle - \frac{3}{2}(i_\xi X)_{N_1N_2N_3} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4}\langle\phi^-, X_{M_1M_2M_3[N_1}\Gamma_{N_2N_3]}{}^{M_1M_2M_3}\phi^+\rangle \\ &- \frac{3}{2}\langle\phi^-, X_{M_1M_2[N_1N_2}\Gamma_{N_3]}{}^{M_1M_2}\phi^+\rangle \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.54}$$

The final two terms in this expression may be simplified further by noting that

$$\langle \phi^-, X_{M_1 M_2 [N_1 N_2} \Gamma_{N_3]}{}^{M_1 M_2} \phi^+ \rangle = \frac{2}{3} (i_\xi \star_8 X)_{N_1 N_2 N_3} \ , \tag{5.55}$$

and

$$\langle \phi^-, X_{M_1 M_2 M_3 [N_1} \Gamma_{N_2 N_3]}{}^{M_1 M_2 M_3} \phi^+ \rangle = 6m \langle \phi^-, \Gamma_{N_1 N_2 N_3} \phi^+ \rangle + 2 (i_\xi X)_{N_1 N_2 N_3} \ , \tag{5.56}$$

where these conditions follow from (5.33) on evaluating

$$\langle \phi^-, X_{M_1 M_2 M_3 M_4} \Gamma^{M_1 M_2 M_3 M_4} \Gamma_{N_1 N_2 N_3} \phi^+ \rangle \ , \tag{5.57}$$

and also

$$\langle \phi^-, \Gamma_{N_1 N_2 N_3} X_{M_1 M_2 M_3 M_4} \Gamma^{M_1 M_2 M_3 M_4} \phi^+ \rangle \ , \tag{5.58}$$

and taking the sum and difference of the resulting equations. On substituting (5.55) and (5.56) into (5.54), it follows that

$$\tilde{\nabla}^N \hat{\varphi}_{N N_1 N_2 N_3} \quad = \quad -2m \langle \phi^-, \Gamma_{N_1 N_2 N_3} \phi^+ \rangle - 2 (i_\xi X^+)_{N_1 N_2 N_3} \ . \tag{5.59}$$

It then follows from (5.59) that

$$\xi \wedge d\hat{\varphi} = 0 \ . \tag{5.60}$$

In addition, using the identity

$$\langle \phi^-, \Gamma_{N_1 N_2 N_3} \phi^+ \rangle \hat{\varphi}^{N_1 N_2 N_3}{}_M = -42 \langle \phi^+, \phi^+ \rangle \xi_A \ , \tag{5.61}$$

together with (5.48) and (5.49) it follows that

$$\star_8 \big(\hat{\varphi} \wedge \star_8 d\hat{\varphi} \big) = 11 m f^2 \xi \ , \tag{5.62}$$

which relates the Lee form of $\hat{\varphi}$ to ξ.

To summarize, the conditions on the geometry of M_8 are given by (5.39), (5.46), (5.50), (5.51), (5.52), (5.60) and (5.62). We remark that if we assume that all spinor bilinears are analytic on M_8, then (5.46) and (5.52) are implied by the other conditions on the geometry of M_8. The Killing spinor equations also determine a number of the components of X in terms of the geometry. These can be found in appendix D together with a description of the conditions on the geometry.

5.2.5 An example

To construct an explicit example, we take $M^8 = S^2 \times M^6$, where M^6 is a compact Kähler 6-manifold. Next suppose that ω_1 and ω_2 are the Kähler forms of S^2 and M^6, respectively. Define

$$X^\pm = \frac{m}{2} \big(\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 \pm \frac{1}{2} \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \big) \ . \tag{5.63}$$

It is clear that $X^{\pm}$ are closed, and that the second algebraic condition in (5.32) is also satisfied.

Furthermore to solve the conditions on the spinors $\phi^{\pm}$ given in (5.33), we write the spinors $\phi^{\pm}$ as

$$\phi^{+} = \eta^{(++)} + \eta^{(--)}, \qquad \phi^{-} = \eta^{(+-)} + \eta^{(-+)} \ , \tag{5.64}$$

and restrict them as follows

$$\frac{1}{2}(\omega_1)_{ab}\Gamma^{ab}\eta^{(\pm\sigma)} = \pm i\eta^{(\pm\sigma)} \ , \qquad \frac{1}{2}(\omega_2)_{rs}\Gamma^{rs}\eta^{(\sigma\pm)} = \pm 3i\eta^{(\sigma\pm)} \ , \tag{5.65}$$

where we have decomposed the indices $A = (a, r)$ according to the product $M^8 = S^2 \times M^6$ and $\sigma = \pm$. Observe the Clifford algebra element associated with ω_2 has eigenvalues $\pm 3i$, where the sign depends on the 6-dimensional chirality of the spinor. So the restriction on the spinors $\phi^{\pm}$ is that they should lie on the eigenspaces with $\pm 3i$ eigenvalues. To do this, we have complexified the spinors to solve the eigenvalue problem but at the end since we are considering products of projections the resulting eigenspaces are real.

Taking $X^{\pm}$ as in (5.33) and spinors satisfying the projection (5.65), one can show that the KSEs can be solved using

$$(\omega_2 \wedge \omega_2)_{A_1A_2A_3A_4}\Gamma^{A_1A_2A_3A_4}\eta = -144\eta \ , \quad (\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2)_{A_1A_2A_3A_4}\Gamma^{A_1A_2A_3A_4}\eta = \mp 72\sigma\eta \ , \tag{5.66}$$

where σ is the sign of the projection associated with ω_1.

Next, consider the Einstein equations (5.32). One finds that with the choice of $X^{\pm}$ as in (5.33), $\tilde{R}^{(6)}_{rs} = 0$, which in turn implies that M^6 must be a Calabi-Yau manifold. Furthermore the Ricci scalar of the S^2 must be $\tilde{R}^{(2)}_{S^2} = 2m^2$, and so S^2 is the round 2-sphere. Hence this solution is $AdS_3 \times S^2 \times \mathrm{CY}^6$, which corresponds to the uplift of the $D = 5$ magnetic black ring near horizon geometry to 11 dimensions.

Let us now investigate the obstruction to the existence of a *Spin*(7) structure (5.37) on $M^8 = S^2 \times \mathrm{CY}^6$ which arises in the example above. If the obstruction does not vanish, it will exclude all *Spin*(7) structures on M^8 and not only the holonomy *Spin*(7) structure. For all product manifolds $M^2 \times M^6$, the Pontryagin classes p_1 and p_2 vanish. Therefore the obstruction to the existence of a *Spin*(7) structure is the Euler number which for the example above is $e(M^8) = e(S^2)e(\mathrm{CY}^6) = 2e(\mathrm{CY}^6)$. So if the Euler number of the Calabi-Yau manifold does not vanish, then M^8 cannot admit a *Spin*(7) structure as expected.

6 Relation to heterotic horizons

As another example, we shall demonstrate the heterotic horizons [20] are included in M-horizons. For this, we shall use the well known compactification ansatz

$$ds^2_{(11)} = e^{\frac{4}{3}\mathring{\Phi}}dx^2 + e^{-\frac{2}{3}\mathring{\Phi}}ds^2_{(10)} \ , \quad F = dx \wedge H \ , \tag{6.1}$$

and identify the $\mathbf{e}^\sharp$ direction of Appendix A with $\mathbf{e}^\sharp = -e^{\frac{2}{3}\mathring{\Phi}}dx$, where $\mathring{\Phi}$ is the dilaton. In addition, the heterotic horizon geometries can be written as

$$ds^2_{(10)} = 2e^+e^- + ds^2_{(8)} \ , \quad H = d(e^- \wedge e^+) + H_{(8)} \ , \quad dH_{(8)} = 0 \ , \tag{6.2}$$

where

$$e^{+} = du \ , \quad e^{-} = ds + s h_{(8)} \ , \tag{6.3}$$

$(ds^2_{(8)}, H_{(8)})$ is the metric and 3-form torsion of the spatial horizon section $\mathcal{S}^8$, and the dilaton $\mathring{\Phi}$ is a function of $\mathcal{S}^8$. If the heterotic horizons preserve at least one supersymmetry [20], then

$$dh_{(8)} \in \mathfrak{spin}(7) \ , \quad 2d\mathring{\Phi} + h_{(8)} = \theta_{\psi} \ , \quad \mathrm{hol}(\hat{\nabla}_{(8)}) \subseteq Spin(7) \ , \tag{6.4}$$

where θ_ψ is the Lee form of the fundamental $Spin(7)$ form ψ and $\hat{\nabla}_{(8)}$ is the connection with skew-symmetric torsion on the $\mathcal{S}^8$. The first two conditions are consequences of the dilatino KSE while the last is implied by the gravitino KSE. To embed the heterotic horizons into M-horizons using (6.1), we have to recover the above conditions from the supersymmetry conditions derived for M-horizons in appendix A.

First substituting (6.2) into (6.1), we demonstrate that the lifting of a heterotic horizon to 11 dimensions is an M-horizon. Beginning with the metric and after a straightforward calculation, one finds that the lifted heterotic horizon is an M-horizon with

$$r = e^{-\frac{2}{3}\mathring{\Phi}} s \ , \quad h = h_{(8)} + e^{-\frac{2}{3}\mathring{\Phi}} d e^{\frac{2}{3}\mathring{\Phi}} \ , \quad \Delta = 0 \ . \tag{6.5}$$

Similarly, the 3-form flux of the heterotic horizons lifts to a 4-form flux of M-horizons with

$$Y = -\mathbf{e}^{\sharp} \wedge h_{(8)} \ , \quad X = -e^{-\frac{2}{3}\mathring{\Phi}} \mathbf{e}^{\sharp} \wedge H_{(8)} \ . \tag{6.6}$$

It remains to prove that the supersymmetry conditions of the heterotic horizons (6.4) solve the conditions of M-horizons stated in appendix A for $\Delta = 0$.

It is clear from the form of the flux F associated with these M-horizons that the relevant conditions are (A.38), (A.27), (A.28), (A.42) and (A.43). All the other rest of conditions are automatically satisfied. First observe that

$$dh = dh_{(8)} \ , \tag{6.7}$$

and indeed the condition (A.25) in Appendix A implies that $dh \in \mathfrak{spin}(7)$. Thus the first condition in (6.4) is compatible with that in Appendix A.

The second condition in (6.4) is equivalent to (A.28). This can be verified by a straightforward computation. Observe that the vanishing of $h_\sharp$ is compatible with (A.27) as the direction $\mathbf{e}^\sharp$ is generated by an isometry.

It remains to demonstrate that the last equation in (6.4) are also equivalent to the conditions (A.42) and (A.43) stated in appendix A. For this suffices to show that the gravitino KSE of M-theory for the backgrounds given in (6.1), (6.5) and (6.6) reduce to that of heterotic supergravity. In both cases, the gravitino KSEs have been evaluated on the same spinor $\phi = 1 + e_{1234}$. To prove this, first act with a gamma matrix on $\Theta_+\phi = 0$, as $\Delta = 0$, to find

$$\big(h_i + \Gamma_i{}^j h_j + \frac{1}{72} X_{\ell_1\ldots\ell_4} \Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ldots\ell_4} + \frac{1}{18} X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{3} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} \Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2} + \frac{2}{3} Y_{ij} \Gamma^j\big)\phi = 0 \ , \tag{6.8}$$

where $i, j, k = 1, \dots 8$ are indices of the heterotic horizons section $\mathcal{S}^8$. Using this, the parallel transport equation on the horizon section (4.1) can be simplified as

$$\tilde{\nabla}_i \phi + \big(\frac{1}{4}\Gamma_i{}^j h_j + \frac{1}{24} X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{8}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\big)\phi = 0 \ . \tag{6.9}$$

Evaluating this on the background (6.1), (6.5) and (6.6) and along the $i = (\alpha, \bar{\alpha})$ directions, we find that

$$(\tilde{\nabla}_{(8)\, i} - \frac{1}{8} H_{ijk}\Gamma^{jk})\phi = 0 \ , \tag{6.10}$$

where now the frame components of the H flux has been computed in terms of the frame of the 10-dimensional metric and i, j, k are frame indices of the heterotic horizon section $\mathcal{S}^8$. The resulting expression is the gravitino KSE of the heterotic horizons. As a result all heterotic horizons can be lifted to M-theory horizons. The 9-dimensional sections of M-horizons are warped products, $\mathcal{S}^9 = S^1 \times_w \mathcal{S}^8$,

$$ds^2(\mathcal{S}^9) = e^{\frac{4}{3}\mathring{\Phi}} dx^2 + e^{-\frac{2}{3}\mathring{\Phi}} ds^2(\mathcal{S}^8) \ , \tag{6.11}$$

and the warp factors are related to the dilaton.

We have shown that all heterotic horizons are special cases of M-horizons. One of the key properties of the heterotic horizons is that exhibit supersymmetry enhancement. In particular, if $h_{(8)} \neq 0$, then the heterotic horizons preserve at least two supersymmetries. This class of backgrounds also exhibits supersymmetry enhancement in M-theory. However, it is not apparent that all M-horizons preserve at least two supersymmetries.

7 Concluding Remarks

We have identified the geometry of M-horizons that preserve at least one supersymmetry. The horizon sections are 9-dimensional manifolds with a *Spin*(7) structure which is appropriately geometrically restricted. The full solution of the KSEs and the geometric conditions are presented in appendix A. We have also proved, using the field equations, a Lichnerowicz type of theorem for horizon sections. In particular, we have shown that the zero modes of an appropriate Dirac equation which couples to the 4-form fluxes are parallel with respect to the supercovariant connection as restricted to a horizon section. This gives an alternative characterization of the solution to the KSEs which is advantageous for the investigation of some examples. We have also shown that the heterotic horizons can be lifted to M-horizons.

Although the KSE for M-horizons can be solved for one Killing spinor and the geometry of the solutions can be identified, the understanding of these backgrounds is less complete than those of other supergravity theories, such as $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories in 4 and 5 dimensions, $(1, 0)$ 6-dimensional supergravity and heterotic theories. There are several obstacles to this. The first obstacle is our limited understanding of the supersymmetric solutions of 11-dimensional supergravity preserving any number of supersymmetries. This is a well known problem and apart from the solution of the KSEs for one Killing spinor, and the classification of backgrounds with more than 29 Killing spinors [33, 34, 35], no other general results are available, see also [36]. The second obstacle is to find a general method to solve the field equations which are not implied by the KSEs. This is typically done by applying the maximum principle on a scalar constructed from the data of the problem and utilizing the compactness of the horizon section. The scalars that are typically used for this are either Δ or h^2 that appear in the metric (2.1). However, we know that for general M-horizons one cannot formulate a maximum principle for h^2 as there are examples for which h^2 is not a constant. For Δ the status of the maximum principle is less clear. We give the equations, which are derived from the field equations, that restrict Δ and h^2 and could be suitable for an application of the maximum principle. But as expected the various terms that enter have an indefinite sign and so the maximum principle cannot apply unless additional restrictions are imposed on the fields by hand. Perhaps this problem of applying the maximum principle can be resolved for M-horizons preserving sufficiently large number of supersymmetries.

A related problem for M-horizons is supersymmetry enhancement. For many horizons that preserve one supersymmetry one can show, using the compactness of the horizon sections and an application of the maximum principle, that the solution exhibits supersymmetry enhancement. For example heterotic horizons with non-vanishing rotation preserve 2,4,6,8 and 16 supersymmetries. For M-horizons, it is not apparent that such an enhancement takes place. Again, the role played by the maximum principle in supersymmetry enhancement is expected to be particularly important.

Despite these issues, significant progress has been made in the identification of M-horizon geometries. It is clear that the geometry of M-horizons preserving more than one supersymmetry is a special case of that which we have found for horizons preserving one supersymmetry. In addition, the Lichnerowicz type of techniques we have introduced give a new insight into the topology and geometry of the horizon sections, and lead to a generalization of the Lichnerowicz theorem. This technique can be applied to similar problems in other supergravity theories and may lead to a better understanding of supergravity backgrounds.

Acknowledgements

JG is supported by the STFC grant, ST/1004874/1. GP is partially supported by the STFC rolling grant ST/J002798/1.

Appendix A Solution of Linear System

A.1 Conventions and Spinor bi-linears

The choice of the spacetime frame and our spinor conventions are as those in [17]. In particular, the eleven-dimensional volume form is chosen as

$$d\mathrm{vol} = \mathbf{e}^{0512346789\sharp} \ . \tag{A.1}$$

In terms of the complex frame basis $e^\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbf{e}^\alpha + i\mathbf{e}^{\alpha+5})$, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, 4$, adapted to the realization of spinors as multi-forms, we have

$$d\mathrm{vol} = \mathbf{e}^{+-} \wedge e^{1\bar{1}} \wedge e^{2\bar{2}} \wedge e^{3\bar{3}} \wedge e^{4\bar{4}} \wedge \mathbf{e}^\sharp \ , \tag{A.2}$$

where the spacetime indices decompose as $A = (+, -, i)$ and $i = (\sharp, \alpha, \bar{\alpha})$. The volume form can also be expressed in terms of the (almost) Hermitian form ω and the (4,0)-form χ,

$$\omega = -i\delta_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} e^\alpha \wedge e^{\bar{\beta}} \ , \quad \chi = 4e^{1234} \ , \tag{A.3}$$

respectively, as

$$d\mathrm{vol} = \frac{1}{24}\mathbf{e}^+ \wedge \mathbf{e}^- \wedge \omega \wedge \omega \wedge \omega \wedge \omega \wedge \mathbf{e}^\sharp = \frac{1}{16}\mathbf{e}^+ \wedge \mathbf{e}^- \wedge \chi \wedge \bar{\chi} \wedge \mathbf{e}^\sharp \ . \tag{A.4}$$

A direct computation reveals that the form bilinears of the Killing spinor ϵ in (3.30) up to an overall numerical normalization are as follows. The 1-form bilinear is

$$V = \mathbf{e}^- - \frac{1}{2}\Delta r^2 \mathbf{e}^+ \ . \tag{A.5}$$

The 2-form bilinear is

$$\alpha = 2(\mathbf{e}^- + \frac{1}{2}r^2\Delta\mathbf{e}^+) \wedge \mathbf{e}^\sharp - 4r\Phi\omega \tag{A.6}$$

and the 5-form bilinear is

$$\sigma = -\{(\mathbf{e}^- + \frac{1}{2}\Delta r^2\mathbf{e}^+ + 2ir\Phi\mathbf{e}^\sharp) \wedge \chi + \text{c.c.}\} + (\mathbf{e}^- - \frac{1}{2}\Delta r^2\mathbf{e}^+) \wedge \omega \wedge \omega \ . \tag{A.7}$$

A.2 Linear system

Suppose that we choose the gauge $\zeta = \Theta_+\phi_+ = i\Phi(1 - e_{1234})$, see (3.29). Then the linear system obtained from (3.24), (3.25) and (3.29) is

$$-\frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\alpha,\beta}{}^{\beta} + \frac{1}{4}h_\alpha - \frac{1}{4}X_{\sharp\alpha\beta}{}^{\beta} + \frac{1}{4}Y_{\sharp\alpha} = 0 \ , \tag{A.8}$$

$$\Omega_{\mu_1,\sharp\mu_2} - \frac{1}{2}X_{\mu_1\mu_2\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{6}X_{\mu_1\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{\lambda}_2\bar{\lambda}_3}\epsilon^{\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{\lambda}_2\bar{\lambda}_3}{}_{\mu_2} + \frac{1}{2}Y_{\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{2}Y_{\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{\lambda}_2}\epsilon^{\bar{\lambda}_1\bar{\lambda}_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} = 0 \ , \tag{A.9}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\beta,\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\beta,\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{1}{4}X_{\sharp\beta\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{8}X_{\sharp\beta\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{1}{4}(h_{\bar\lambda} + Y_{\sharp\bar\lambda})\epsilon^{\bar\lambda}{}_{\beta\mu_1\mu_2} = 0 \ , \tag{A.10}$$

$$-\Omega_{\bar\beta,\sharp\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}X_{\bar\beta\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{2}Y_{\bar\beta\alpha} + \Big(- \frac{1}{4}h_{\sharp} + i\Phi + \frac{1}{8}X_{\sigma}{}^{\sigma}{}_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda}\Big)\delta_{\bar\beta\alpha} = 0 \ , \tag{A.11}$$

$$\Omega_{\sharp,\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}Y_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda} + 2i\Phi = 0 \ , \tag{A.12}$$

$$\Omega_{\sharp,\sharp\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}h_{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}X_{\sharp\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{6}X_{\sharp\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}{}_{\alpha} = 0 \ , \tag{A.13}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\sharp,\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\sharp,\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{4}Y_{\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{1}{8}Y_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} = 0 \ , \tag{A.14}$$

$$-h_{\sharp} + \frac{2}{3}Y_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{6}X_{\sigma}{}^{\sigma}{}_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{18}X_{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4}\epsilon^{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4} - 4i\Phi = 0 \ , \tag{A.15}$$

$$h_{\alpha} + \frac{2}{3}Y_{\sharp\alpha} - \frac{1}{3}X_{\sharp\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{9}X_{\sharp\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}{}_{\alpha} = 0 \ , \tag{A.16}$$

$$2Y_{\mu_1\mu_2} - Y_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} - X_{\sigma}{}^{\sigma}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{2}X_{\sigma}{}^{\sigma}{}_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} = 0 \ , \tag{A.17}$$

$$-i\tilde\nabla_{\alpha}\Phi + \frac{i}{2}\Phi h_{\alpha} - \frac{i}{2}\Phi X_{\sharp\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}dh_{\sharp\alpha} + \frac{1}{12}\epsilon_{\alpha}{}^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}d_hY_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3} = 0 \ , \tag{A.18}$$

$$-i\Phi X_{\sharp\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{3}{4}dh_{\sharp\alpha} - \frac{1}{4}d_hY_{\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{12}\epsilon_{\alpha}{}^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}d_hY_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3} = 0 \ , \tag{A.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-i\Phi Y_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} - i\Phi X_{\mu_1\mu_2\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - dh_{\mu_1\mu_2} \\ &+\frac{1}{4}dh_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{1}{4}d_hY_{\sharp\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} = 0 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{A.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &-i\Phi\Omega_{\beta,\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{i}{4}\Phi X_{\sharp\beta\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{8}dh_{\sharp\bar\lambda}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda}{}_{\beta\mu_1\mu_2} \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{8}d_hY_{\mu}{}^{\mu}{}_{\bar\lambda}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda}{}_{\beta\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{1}{8}d_hY_{\beta\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} = 0 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{A.21}$$

$$i\Phi X_{\bar\beta\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}d_hY_{\sharp\bar\beta\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}dh_{\bar\beta\alpha} + \Big(- \frac{1}{4}dh_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda} - \frac{1}{4}d_hY_{\sharp\lambda}{}^{\lambda}\Big)\delta_{\bar\beta\alpha} = 0 \ , \tag{A.22}$$

$$i\tilde{\nabla}_\sharp\Phi - \frac{i}{2}\Phi h_\sharp + \frac{1}{8}dh_\lambda{}^\lambda - \frac{1}{8}d_h Y_{\sharp\lambda}{}^\lambda = 0 \ , \tag{A.23}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -i\Phi\Omega_{\sharp\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{i}{2}\Phi Y_{\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{1}{8}dh_{\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{16}dh_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} \\ -\frac{1}{8}d_h Y_{\sharp\mu_1\mu_2} + \frac{1}{16}d_h Y_{\sharp\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} = 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{A.24}$$

The above conditions have been expressed in representations of the $S(4)$ subgroup of $Spin(7)$. Investigating these conditions, one can show that the algebraic conditions (3.7) and (3.8) hold automatically, as a consequence of (3.24), (3.25) and (3.20).

A.3 Solution for $\Delta \neq 0$

Suppose that $\Delta \neq 0$ and so $\Phi \neq 0$ at some patch. Under this assumption, the linear system can be solved to express some of the fluxes in terms of the geometry and determine the conditions on the geometry imposed by supersymmetry. In particular, the conditions (A.8)-(A.24) can be solved as

$$Y = -d_h\mathbf{e}^\sharp - 2\Phi\omega \ , \tag{A.25}$$

where ω is given in (A.3), and

$$\Phi = -\frac{i}{2}\big(\Omega_{\sharp,\lambda}{}^\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\Omega^\lambda{}_{,\sharp\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^\lambda\big) \ , \tag{A.26}$$

$$h_\sharp = -\frac{1}{2}\big(\Omega^\lambda{}_{,\sharp\lambda} + \Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^\lambda\big) \ , \tag{A.27}$$

$$h_\alpha = -\frac{2}{3}\Omega_{\bar\lambda_1,\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}{}_\alpha + \frac{4}{3}\Omega_{\bar\lambda,}{}^{\bar\lambda}{}_\alpha - \frac{2}{3}\Omega_{\alpha,\lambda}{}^\lambda + \frac{1}{3}\Omega_{\sharp,\sharp\alpha} \ . \tag{A.28}$$

Also, Φ is given as

$$\partial_\alpha\Phi = \Phi\big(- \frac{4}{3}\Omega_{\bar\lambda_1,\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}{}_\alpha + \frac{2}{3}\Omega_{\bar\lambda,}{}^{\bar\lambda}{}_\alpha + \frac{2}{3}\Omega_{\alpha,\lambda}{}^\lambda - \frac{1}{3}\Omega_{\sharp,\sharp\alpha}\big) + \frac{i}{2}dh_{\sharp\alpha} \ , \tag{A.29}$$

$$\partial_\sharp\Phi = -\frac{1}{4}\Phi\big(\Omega^\lambda{}_{,\sharp\lambda} + \Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^\lambda + X_\lambda{}^\lambda{}_\sigma{}^\sigma\big) + \frac{i}{2}dh_\lambda{}^\lambda \ . \tag{A.30}$$

The 4-form X can be expressed

$$X_{\mu\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3} = \big(- \Omega_{\mu,\sharp\sigma} + \Omega_{\sharp,\mu\sigma} - 2\Omega_{[\mu|,\sharp|\sigma]} + \frac{i}{2}\Phi^{-1}dh_{\mu\sigma} - \frac{i}{4}\Phi^{-1}dh_{\bar\nu_1\bar\nu_2}\epsilon^{\bar\nu_1\bar\nu_2}{}_{\mu\sigma}\big)\epsilon^\sigma{}_{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3} , \tag{A.31}$$

$$X_{\bar\beta\alpha\lambda}{}^\lambda + \frac{1}{4}X_\lambda{}^\lambda{}_\sigma{}^\sigma\delta_{\bar\beta\alpha} = \Omega_{\bar\beta,\sharp\alpha} + \Omega_{\alpha,\sharp\bar\beta} - \frac{1}{4}\big(\Omega^\lambda{}_{,\sharp\lambda} + \Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^\lambda\big)\delta_{\bar\beta\alpha} \ , \tag{A.32}$$

$$\frac{2}{3}\Omega_{\sharp,\lambda}{}^{\lambda}+\frac{1}{6}\Omega^{\lambda}{}_{,\sharp\lambda}+\frac{5}{6}\Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^{\lambda}+\frac{1}{6}X_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\sigma}{}^{\sigma}+\frac{1}{18}X_{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3\lambda_4}\epsilon^{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3\lambda_4}=0\ , \tag{A.33}$$

$$X_{\sharp\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3}=-2\Omega_{[\lambda_1,\lambda_2\lambda_3]}+\frac{2}{3}\big(-\Omega_{\lambda,}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\bar\sigma}+\Omega_{\bar\sigma,\lambda}{}^{\lambda}-\Omega_{\sharp,\sharp\bar\sigma}\big)\epsilon^{\bar\sigma}{}_{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3}\ , \tag{A.34}$$

$$\begin{aligned}X_{\sharp\beta\bar\sigma_1\bar\sigma_2} &= \frac{2}{3}\big(\Omega_{\beta,\mu_1\mu_2}+\Omega_{\mu_1,\beta\mu_2}\big)\epsilon^{\mu_1\mu_2}{}_{\bar\sigma_1\bar\sigma_2}-2\Omega_{\beta,\bar\sigma_1\bar\sigma_2}\\ &+ \left(-\frac{4}{3}\Omega_{\lambda,}{}^{\lambda}{}_{[\bar\sigma_1}+\frac{4}{3}\Omega_{[\bar\sigma_1,|\lambda|}{}^{\lambda}+\frac{2}{3}\Omega_{\sharp,\sharp[\bar\sigma_1}\right)\delta_{\bar\sigma_2]\beta}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{A.35}$$

The linear system also imposes the following condition on the geometry

$$\Omega_{[\mu_1,|\sharp|\mu_2]}-\Omega_{\sharp,\mu_1\mu_2}-\frac{1}{2}\big(\Omega_{\bar\sigma_1,\sharp\bar\sigma_2}-\Omega_{\sharp,\bar\sigma_1\bar\sigma_2}\big)\epsilon^{\bar\sigma_1\bar\sigma_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2}=0\ . \tag{A.36}$$

This is the only constraint on the geometry of $\mathcal{S}$ directly implied from the solution of the KSEs in the (3.29) gauge. One can derive additional conditions after substituting the expressions of Φ and h in terms of the geometry into (A.29) and (A.30). Such conditions are quadratic in the spin connection and are reminiscent of integrability conditions.

A.4 Solution for $\Delta = 0$

Let us now turn to the $\Delta = \Phi = 0$ case. The solution to the linear system is

$$Y=-d_h\mathbf{e}^{\sharp}\ , \tag{A.37}$$

and h is given as in (A.27) and (A.28). Moreover,

$$dh_{\sharp\alpha}=dh_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda}=0\ ,\quad dh_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}{}^{\bar\beta_1\bar\beta_2}dh_{\bar\beta_1\bar\beta_2}=0\ . \tag{A.38}$$

The 4-form X can be expressed

$$\begin{aligned}&X_{(\mu_1|\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3|}\epsilon^{\bar\lambda_1\bar\lambda_2\bar\lambda_3}{}_{\mu_2)}=6\Omega_{(\mu_1,|\sharp|\mu_2)}\ ,\\ &X_{\alpha_1\alpha_2\lambda}{}^{\lambda}+\frac{1}{2}X_{\bar\mu_1\bar\mu_2\lambda}{}^{\lambda}\epsilon^{\bar\mu_1\bar\mu_2}{}_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}=4\Omega_{[\alpha_1,|\sharp|\alpha_2]}-2\Omega_{[\bar\mu_1,|\sharp|\bar\mu_2]}\epsilon^{\bar\mu_1\bar\mu_2}{}_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{A.39}$$

$$X_{\bar\beta\alpha\lambda}{}^{\lambda}+\frac{1}{4}X_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\sigma}{}^{\sigma}\delta_{\bar\beta\alpha}=\Omega_{\bar\beta,\sharp\alpha}+\Omega_{\alpha,\sharp\bar\beta}-\frac{1}{4}\big(\Omega^{\lambda}{}_{,\sharp\lambda}+\Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^{\lambda}\big)\delta_{\bar\beta\alpha}\ , \tag{A.40}$$

$$-\frac{1}{6}\Omega^{\lambda}{}_{,\sharp\lambda}+\frac{7}{6}\Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^{\lambda}+\frac{1}{6}X_{\lambda}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\sigma}{}^{\sigma}+\frac{1}{18}X_{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3\lambda_4}\epsilon^{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3\lambda_4}=0\ , \tag{A.41}$$

$$X_{\sharp\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3}=-2\Omega_{[\lambda_1,\lambda_2\lambda_3]}+\frac{2}{3}\big(-\Omega_{\lambda,}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\bar\sigma}+\Omega_{\bar\sigma,\lambda}{}^{\lambda}-\Omega_{\sharp,\sharp\bar\sigma}\big)\epsilon^{\bar\sigma}{}_{\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3}\ , \tag{A.42}$$

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\sharp\beta\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_2} &= \frac{2}{3}\big(\Omega_{\beta,\mu_1\mu_2} + \Omega_{\mu_1,\beta\mu_2}\big)\epsilon^{\mu_1\mu_2}{}_{\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_2} - 2\Omega_{\beta,\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_2} \\ &+ \left(-\frac{4}{3}\Omega_{\lambda,}{}^{\lambda}{}_{[\bar{\sigma}_1} + \frac{4}{3}\Omega_{[\bar{\sigma}_1,|\lambda|}{}^{\lambda} + \frac{2}{3}\Omega_{\sharp,\sharp[\bar{\sigma}_1}\right)\delta_{\bar{\sigma}_2]\beta}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{A.43}$$

The linear system also imposes the following conditions on the geometry

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{[\mu_1,|\sharp|\mu_2]} - \Omega_{\sharp,\mu_1\mu_2} - \frac{1}{2}\big(\Omega_{\bar{\sigma}_1,\sharp\bar{\sigma}_2} - \Omega_{\sharp,\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_2}\big)\epsilon^{\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_2}{}_{\mu_1\mu_2} &= 0\ , \\ \Omega_{\sharp,\lambda}{}^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{2}\Omega^{\lambda}{}_{,\sharp\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\lambda,\sharp}{}^{\lambda} &= 0\ . \end{aligned} \tag{A.44}$$

This concludes the analysis of the linear system.

Appendix B Analysis of Integrability Conditions

In this Appendix we present the proof that (3.25) is implied by (3.24) and (3.20), together with (2.7), the 4-form field equations (2.9) and (2.10), and the components of the Einstein equations on $\mathcal{S}$.

First, use (3.20) to eliminate the ζ from (3.25), and then use (3.24) to eliminate the supercovariant derivative of $1+e_{1234}$. Then (3.25) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big(\frac{1}{4}\tilde{\nabla}_j h_i \Gamma^j + \frac{1}{72}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} dY_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} - \frac{1}{12}(dY)_{i\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} + \frac{1}{12}\tilde{\nabla}_i Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} \\ &+\frac{1}{288}\tilde{\nabla}_i X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} - \frac{1}{48}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} h_{\ell_1} Y_{\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{8} h_{[i} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2]}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} \\ &-\frac{1}{144}(i_h X)_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{24}(i_h X)_{i\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{1}{8}h_i h_j \Gamma^j \\ &+\frac{1}{41472}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7\ell_8} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X_{\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7\ell_8} - \frac{1}{5184} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X_{i\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7} \\ &-\frac{1}{576} X_{mn\ell_1\ell_2} X^{mn}{}_{\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{864} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}{}^{m} X_{i\ell_4\ell_5 m}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5} + \frac{1}{144} X^{mn}{}_{\ell_1\ell_2} X_{i\ell_3 mn}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \\ &-\frac{1}{432} X_{\ell}{}^{q_1q_2q_3} X_{iq_1q_2q_3}\Gamma^{\ell} + \frac{1}{1728} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma_i + \frac{1}{72} Y_{i\ell_1} Y_{\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{18} Y_{qm} Y_i{}^{m}\Gamma^q \\ &-\frac{1}{108} Y_i{}^{m} X_{m\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{1728}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} X_{\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6} - \frac{1}{144} Y^{mn} X_{mn\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2} \\ &-\frac{1}{288} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} X_{i\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5} + \frac{1}{48} Y^{mn} X_{imnq}\Gamma^q + \frac{1}{432} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}{}^{m} Y_{\ell_4 m}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Big)(1+e_{1234}) = 0\ . \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

Next consider (3.24). Note that

$$\frac{1}{2}\Gamma^j(\tilde{\nabla}_j\tilde{\nabla}_i - \tilde{\nabla}_i\tilde{\nabla}_j)(1+e_{1234}) = \frac{1}{4}\tilde{R}_{ij}\Gamma^j(1+e_{1234})\ , \tag{B.2}$$

where $\tilde{R}_{ij}$ denotes the Ricci tensor of $\mathcal{S}$. Hence, on using (3.24) to evaluate the LHS of the above expression in terms of the fluxes h, X, Y and their covariant derivatives, we obtain the following condition

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(&-\frac{1}{4}\tilde{R}_{ij}\Gamma^j + \frac{1}{8}(\tilde{\nabla}_j h_i - \tilde{\nabla}_i h_j)\Gamma^j + \frac{1}{72}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}(dY)_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} - \frac{1}{12}(dY)_{i\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} \\
&+\frac{1}{12}\tilde{\nabla}_i Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} + \frac{1}{288}\tilde{\nabla}_i X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} - \frac{1}{48}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}h_{\ell_1}Y_{\ell_2\ell_3} - \frac{1}{144}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}(i_h X)_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \\
&+\frac{1}{8}h_{[i}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2]}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} + \frac{1}{24}(i_h X)_{i\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} \\
&+\frac{1}{41472}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7\ell_8}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X_{\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7\ell_8} - \frac{1}{5184}X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}X_{\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7} \\
&-\frac{1}{576}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X^{mn}{}_{\ell_1\ell_2}X_{mn\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{144}X_{i\ell_1 mn}X^{mn}{}_{\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \\
&-\frac{1}{864}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma_i + \frac{1}{864}X_{i\ell_1\ell_2}{}^m X_{\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5 m}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5} + \frac{1}{54}X_{imnq}X_\ell{}^{mnq}\Gamma^\ell \\
&+\frac{1}{1728}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}X_{\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6} - \frac{1}{288}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}X_{i\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5} - \frac{1}{432}Y_{m\ell_1}X^m{}_{\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \\
&+\frac{1}{108}Y_{mi}X^m{}_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} - \frac{1}{144}Y^{mn}X_{mn\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2} + \frac{1}{48}Y^{mn}X_{mni\ell}\Gamma^\ell \\
&+\frac{1}{72}Y_{i\ell_1}Y_{\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} + \frac{1}{48}Y^{\ell_1\ell_2}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma_i - \frac{5}{72}Y_{im}Y_\ell{}^m\Gamma^\ell\Big)(1+e_{1234}) = 0\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

We remark that in order to obtain (B.3) we have made use of the 4-form field equations (2.9) and (2.10) to eliminate divergence terms in Y and X in favour of terms quadratic in the fluxes h, Y, X. Furthermore, the terms involving Hodge duals on the RHS of (2.9) and (2.10) have further been rewritten using the duality between $\Gamma^{i_i \cdots i_k}$ and $\Gamma^{j_1 \cdots j_{9-k}}$ when acting on the spinor $1+e_{1234}$. The closure condition $dX = 0$ has also been used in order to simplify some covariant derivatives acting on X.

It remains to compare (B.1) and (B.3). Observe that the terms linear in $\tilde{\nabla}X$, $\tilde{\nabla}Y$, and the quadratic terms of type hX, hY, XY match. For the remaining terms in (B.1) and (B.3) there is a matching for all orders of Gamma matrices, with the exception of the 1-Gamma terms. In particular, on taking subtracting (B.1) from (B.3) one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{1}{4}\Big(\tilde{R}_{ij} + \tilde{\nabla}_{(i}h_{j)} - \frac{1}{2}h_i h_j + \frac{1}{144}X_{\ell_i\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}g_{ij} - \frac{1}{12}X_{j\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}X_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \\
-\frac{1}{12}Y^{\ell_1\ell_2}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}g_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}Y_{im}Y_j{}^m\Big)\Gamma^j(1+e_{1234}) = 0\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

However, this vanishes as a consequence of (2.14).

Therefore, we have established that (3.25) is implied by (3.24), (3.20), together with (2.7), the gauge field equations (2.9) and (2.10), and the components of the Einstein equations on $\mathcal{S}$.

Appendix C A Lichnerowicz Identity

Before we proceed to prove the near horizon Lichnerowicz identity of section 4, we shall elaborate on *Spin*(9) spinors. We begin with a realization of Majorana *Spin*(10, 1) spinors described in appendix A.2 of [17]. In this, the Dirac spinors are identified with $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{C}^5)$. The Majorana spinors span a real 32-dimensional subspace after an appropriate reality condition is imposed. The Dirac spinors of $Spin(9)$ are identified with the subspace $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{C}^4) \subset \Lambda^*(\mathbb{C}^5)$. In particular, if $\mathbb{C}^5 = \mathbb{C} < e_1, \dots e_4, e_5 >$, then $\mathbb{C}^4 = \mathbb{C} < e_1, \dots e_4 >$. The Majorana spinors of $Spin(9)$ are those of $Spin(10,1)$ restricted on $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{C}^4)$. From this, it is straightforward to identify the gamma matrices of $Spin(9)$ from those of $Spin(10,1)$ which have been stated explicitly in [17].

The $Spin(9)$ invariant inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is simply the standard Hermitian inner product on $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{C}^4)$. With respect to this, the skew-symmetric products $\Gamma^{[k]}$ of k $Spin(9)$ gamma matrices are Hermitian for $k = 0 \bmod 4$ and $k = 1 \bmod 4$ while they are anti-Hermitian for $k = 2 \bmod 4$ and $k = 3 \bmod 4$. Using this, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_i^\dagger &= -\frac{1}{4} h_i - \frac{1}{288} \Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} - \frac{1}{36} X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} - \frac{1}{24} \Gamma_i{}^{\ell_1\ell_2} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{1}{6} Y_{ij} \Gamma^j \ , \\ \Psi^\dagger &= -\frac{1}{4} h_\ell \Gamma^\ell + \frac{1}{96} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} - \frac{1}{8} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

where $\dagger$ is the adjoint with respect to the $Spin(9)$-invariant inner product $\langle \ , \ \rangle$.

Next let us turn to the computation of the RHS of (4.7). The term involving $\Psi^{i\dagger}\Psi_i - \Psi^\dagger\Psi$ can be expanded out directly in terms quadratic in the fluxes h, Y, X. In particular

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{i\dagger}\Psi_i &= \frac{1}{16} h^2 + \frac{1}{576} h_{\ell_1} X_{\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5} + \frac{1}{12} (i_h Y)_\ell \Gamma^\ell \\ &- \frac{5}{27648} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X_{\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7\ell_8} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4\ell_5\ell_6\ell_7\ell_8} - \frac{1}{384} X^{mn}{}_{\ell_1\ell_2} X_{mn\ell_3\ell_4} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \\ &+ \frac{7}{1152} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{192} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} Y_{\ell_3\ell_4} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{5}{96} Y^{mn} Y_{mn} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

The term in (4.7) involving $\Gamma^{ij}\tilde{\nabla}_i\tilde{\nabla}_j$ can be rewritten using

$$\Gamma^{ij}\tilde{\nabla}_i\tilde{\nabla}_j\phi = -\frac{1}{4}\tilde{R}\phi \ , \tag{C.3}$$

where $\tilde{R}$ is the Ricci scalar of $\mathcal{S}$. From the Einstein field equation (2.14), one has

$$\tilde{R} = -\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i + \frac{1}{2} h^2 + \frac{1}{4} Y_{mn} Y^{mn} + \frac{1}{48} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \ . \tag{C.4}$$

It follows that

$$\mathrm{Re}\left(\int_{\mathcal{S}} \langle \phi, \Gamma^{ij}\tilde{\nabla}_i\tilde{\nabla}_j\phi \rangle \right) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \langle \phi, \big(-\frac{1}{8} h^2 - \frac{1}{16} Y_{mn} Y^{mn} - \frac{1}{192} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} X^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \big)\phi \rangle \ , \tag{C.5}$$

where we remark that the contribution to the integral obtained from the $\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i$ term is a total derivative because $\langle \phi, \phi \rangle = \mathrm{const}$, and hence its integral vanishes. Alternatively, this term vanishes if one assumes that $\tilde{\nabla}^i h_i = 0$.

To proceed with the evaluation of (4.7) observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\Psi^{i\dagger} - \Psi^i\big)\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi - \big(\Psi^\dagger - \Psi\big)\Gamma^i\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi &= \big(-\frac{1}{72} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \Gamma^{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} - \frac{1}{6} Y^i{}_\ell \Gamma^\ell \big)\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi \\ &+ \big(\frac{1}{72} X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4} + \frac{1}{6} Y_{\ell_1\ell_2} \Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2} \big)\Gamma^i\tilde{\nabla}_i\phi \ . \end{aligned} \tag{C.6}$$

Using the fact that the Clifford algebra element of first term in the RHS of the above equation is self-adjoint, the Bianchi identity $dX = 0$ and upon integrating by parts, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}\,\Big(\int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,\big(\Psi^{i\dagger}-\Psi^{i}\big)\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi-\big(\Psi^{\dagger}-\Psi\big)\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi\rangle\Big) &= \int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,\frac{1}{12}(\tilde{\nabla}^{i}Y_{i\ell})\Gamma^{\ell}\phi\rangle \\ &+\mathrm{Re}\,\Big(\int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,\big(\frac{1}{72}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}+\frac{1}{6}Y_{\ell_1\ell_2}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2}\big)\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi\rangle\Big)\ . \qquad \text{(C.7)}\end{aligned}$$

The term involving $\tilde{\nabla}^{i}Y_{i\ell}$ is then further rewritten as a term quadratic in X using the field equation (2.10). Next, we rewrite the second line in terms of the Dirac operator $\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi+\Psi\phi$, with a compensating term $-\Psi\phi$ which gives a term quadratic in the fluxes h, X, Y, and which can be expanded out straightforwardly.

Next, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\Gamma^{i}\Psi-\Psi\Gamma^{i}\big)\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi &= \big(-\frac{1}{2}h^{i}+\frac{1}{48}\Gamma^{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}+\frac{1}{2}Y^{i}{}_{\ell}\Gamma^{\ell}\big)\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi \\ &+ \big(\frac{1}{2}h_{\ell}\Gamma^{\ell}-\frac{1}{48}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\big)\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi\ . \qquad \text{(C.8)}\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using the self-duality of the Clifford element in the first term in the RHS of the above equation, $dX = 0$ and the condition $\langle\phi,\phi\rangle = \mathrm{const}$, and upon integrating by parts, one finds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}\,\Big(\int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,\big(\Gamma^{i}\Psi-\Psi\Gamma^{i}\big)\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi\rangle\Big) &= \int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,-\frac{1}{4}(\tilde{\nabla}^{i}Y_{i\ell})\Gamma^{\ell}\phi\rangle \\ &+ \mathrm{Re}\,\Big(\int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,\big(\frac{1}{2}h_{\ell}\Gamma^{\ell}-\frac{1}{48}X_{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3\ell_4}\big)\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi\rangle\Big)\ . \\ & \qquad \text{(C.9)}\end{aligned}$$

The term involving $\tilde{\nabla}^{i}Y_{i\ell}$ is then further rewritten as a term quadratic in X using (2.10). The second line is also further rewritten in terms of the Dirac operator $\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\phi+\Psi\phi$, with a compensating term involving $-\Psi\phi$ which gives a term quadratic in the fluxes h, X, Y.

Next note that

$$\begin{aligned}(\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\Psi-\tilde{\nabla}^{i}\Psi_{i})\phi &= \Big(-\frac{1}{8}dh_{ij}\Gamma^{ij}+\frac{1}{72}\tilde{\nabla}^{i}X_{i\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3} \\ &+ \frac{1}{12}\tilde{\nabla}_{\ell_1}Y_{\ell_2\ell_3}\Gamma^{\ell_1\ell_2\ell_3}+\frac{5}{12}\tilde{\nabla}^{i}Y_{i\ell}\Gamma^{\ell}\Big)\phi \\ & \qquad \text{(C.10)}\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\mathrm{Re}\,\Big(\int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,(\Gamma^{i}\tilde{\nabla}_{i}\Psi-\tilde{\nabla}^{i}\Psi_{i})\phi\rangle = \int_{\mathcal{S}}\langle\phi,\frac{5}{12}\tilde{\nabla}^{i}Y_{i\ell}\Gamma^{\ell}\phi\rangle\ , \qquad \text{(C.11)}$$

as the rest of the terms are anti-self-adjoint, and hence imaginary, and so they vanish. The term involving $\tilde{\nabla}^{i}Y_{i\ell}$ is then again rewritten as a term quadratic in X using (2.10)

Appendix D Solution of KSEs on M^8

An alternative way to solve the KSEs (5.35) and (5.33) is to choose representatives for $\phi^{\pm}$ as

$$\phi^+ = f(1 + e_{1234}) \ , \quad \phi^- = g(e_1 + e_{234}) \tag{D.1}$$

where f, g are real functions which may vanish at some points on M^8. This choice can always be made using the local $Spin(8)$ covariance of the equations.

First consider the KSE (5.35) with the Levi-Civita connection acting on ϕ^-. This gives

$$\partial_A g + \frac{g}{2}\Omega_{A,1\bar{1}} - \frac{g}{2}\Omega_{A,p}{}^p + \frac{\sqrt{2}m}{4} f\delta_{A\bar{1}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{12} f X_{Apqr}\epsilon^{pqr} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} f X_{A\bar{1}p}{}^p = 0 \ , \tag{D.2}$$

and

$$\frac{g}{2}\Omega_{A,rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}} + g\Omega_{A,1\bar{p}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}m}{4} f\delta_{A\bar{p}} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} f X_{A1rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} f X_{A\bar{p}\gamma}{}^\gamma = 0 \ , \tag{D.3}$$

where in this section the indices $A = (\alpha, \bar{\alpha})$ with $\alpha = (1, p)$ and $\bar{\alpha} = (\bar{1}, \bar{p})$, and $p = 2, 3, 4$. The conditions which arise from the other KSEs with the Levi-Civita connection acting on ϕ^+ are derived from the above after exchanging $1 \leftrightarrow -\bar{1}$, $g \to f$ and $f \to -g$ and $m \to -m$. The equations decompose under the $SU(3)$ subgroup of G_2 which is the isotropy group of the spinors $\phi^{\pm}$ at non-vanishing points.

Similarly the solution of the (5.33) KSE on the spinor ϕ^+ is

$$\begin{gathered} \frac{1}{18} X_{\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\alpha_4}\epsilon^{\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\alpha_4} + \frac{1}{6} X_{\alpha}{}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}{}^{\beta} + m = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} X_{\alpha}{}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta_1\beta_2}\epsilon^{\beta_1\beta_2}{}_{\bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\gamma}_2} + X_{\alpha}{}^{\alpha}{}_{\bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\gamma}_2} = 0 \end{gathered} \tag{D.4}$$

The conditions on the X^- can be derived by exchanging $1 \leftrightarrow -\bar{1}$ and $m \to -m$.

Next observe that the parallel transport equations, after using (D.4), give

$$\partial_A g + Y_A f = 0 \ , \quad \partial_A f - Y_A g = 0 \ , \quad Y_A = -\frac{\sqrt{2}m}{2}\mathrm{Re}[\delta_{A\bar{1}}] \ . \tag{D.5}$$

Thus f, g depend on one direction in M^8, and $f^2 + g^2$ is constant which we set to 1. So although their vanishing locus may not be isolated their measure is zero because otherwise both must vanish at the same point which is not allowed. As a consequence, although g, f multiply the conditions on the fluxes and so they do not impose a condition at the vanishing locus, the fluxes can be determined everywhere in terms of the geometry as a consequence of continuity. Furthermore, observe that

$$d(gfY) = 0 \tag{D.6}$$

as an integrability condition of (D.5), which agrees with (5.46) as fgY is proportional to ξ.

To solve the linear system (D.2) and (D.4), set $g=\sin\theta$ and $f=\cos\theta$ for some angle θ which depends on spacetime points. Then the fluxes can be expressed in terms of the geometry as

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{1\bar{p}q}{}^{q} &= -\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}\tan\theta\,\Omega_{1,mn}\epsilon^{mn}{}_{\bar{p}}-\frac{4}{\sqrt{2}}\tan\theta\,\Omega_{1,1\bar{p}}\ ,\\
X_{\bar{1}\bar{p}q}{}^{q} &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}\cot\theta\,\Omega_{\bar{1},mn}\epsilon^{mn}{}_{\bar{p}}-\frac{4}{\sqrt{2}}\cot\theta\,\Omega_{\bar{1},\bar{1}\bar{p}}\ ,\\
X_{rsq}{}^{q} &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\bar{p}}{}_{rs}(X_{1\bar{p}q}{}^{q}+X_{\bar{1}\bar{p}q}{}^{q})\ ,\quad X_{rs1\bar{1}}=-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\bar{p}}{}_{rs}(X_{1\bar{p}q}{}^{q}-X_{\bar{1}\bar{p}q}{}^{q})\ ,\\
X_{q\bar{p}r}{}^{r} &= -D^{-}\delta_{q\bar{p}}-\sqrt{2}\big[\frac{\tan\theta-\cot\theta}{2}\Omega_{q,rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}}+\tan\theta\,\Omega_{q,1\bar{p}}+\cot\theta\,\Omega_{q,\bar{1}\bar{p}}\big]\ ,\\
X_{p\bar{q}1\bar{1}} &= (D^{+}-m)\delta_{p\bar{q}}-\sqrt{2}\big[\frac{\tan\theta+\cot\theta}{2}\Omega_{q,rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}}+\tan\theta\,\Omega_{q,1\bar{p}}-\cot\theta\,\Omega_{q,\bar{1}\bar{p}}\big]\ ,\\
X_{1rst}\epsilon^{rst} &= \frac{3}{2}D^{-}-\frac{3}{2}D^{+}\ ,\quad X_{\bar{1}rst}\epsilon^{rst}=-\frac{3}{2}D^{-}-\frac{3}{2}D^{+}\ ,\\
\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}X_{\bar{q}1rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}} &= \frac{1}{2}\tan\theta\,\Omega_{(\bar{q},|rs|}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p})}+\tan\theta\Omega_{(\bar{q},|1|\bar{p})}+\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\epsilon^{m}{}_{\bar{q}\bar{p}}X_{m1\ell}{}^{\ell}\ ,\\
\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}X_{\bar{q}\bar{1}rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}} &= \frac{1}{2}\cot\theta\,\Omega_{(\bar{q},|rs|}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p})}-\cot\theta\Omega_{(\bar{q},|\bar{1}|\bar{p})}+\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\epsilon^{m}{}_{\bar{q}\bar{p}}X_{m\bar{1}\ell}{}^{\ell}\ ,
\end{aligned}\tag{D.7}$$

where

$$D^{\pm}=\sqrt{2}\big[\frac{\tan\theta\pm\cot\theta}{2}+\tan\theta\Omega_{q,1}{}^{q}\mp\cot\theta\Omega_{q,\bar{1}}{}^{q}\big]\ .\tag{D.8}$$

The conditions on the geometry of M^8 implied by the linear system are

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\Omega_{1,rs}+\Omega_{\bar{1},rs})\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}}+2(\Omega_{1,1\bar{p}}+\Omega_{\bar{1},1\bar{p}})=0\ ,\quad(\Omega_{1,rs}+\Omega_{\bar{1},rs})\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}}-2(\Omega_{1,\bar{1}\bar{p}}+\Omega_{\bar{1},\bar{1}\bar{p}})=0\ ,\\
&\Omega_{[\bar{q},|rs|}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}]}+2\Omega_{[\bar{q},|1|\bar{p}]}=0\ ,\quad\Omega_{[\bar{q},|rs|}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}]}-2\Omega_{[\bar{q},|\bar{1}|\bar{p}]}=0\ ,\\
&\Omega_{q,1\bar{1}}-\Omega_{q,p}{}^{p}-2\Omega_{\bar{1},\bar{1}q}-\Omega_{\bar{1},\bar{r}\bar{s}}\epsilon^{\bar{r}\bar{s}}{}_{q}=0\ ,\quad\Omega_{q,1\bar{1}}+\Omega_{q,p}{}^{p}+2\Omega_{1,1q}-\Omega_{1,\bar{r}\bar{s}}\epsilon^{\bar{r}\bar{s}}{}_{q}=0\ ,\\
&\Omega_{q,rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}}-\Omega_{\bar{p},\bar{r}\bar{s}}\epsilon^{\bar{r}\bar{s}}{}_{q}+2\Omega_{q,1\bar{p}}-2\Omega_{\bar{p},\bar{1}q}=0\ ,\quad\Omega_{q,rs}\epsilon^{rs}{}_{\bar{p}}-\Omega_{\bar{p},\bar{r}\bar{s}}\epsilon^{\bar{r}\bar{s}}{}_{q}-2\Omega_{q,\bar{1}\bar{p}}+2\Omega_{\bar{p},1q}=0\\
&-\Omega_{1,p}{}^{p}+\Omega_{r,st}\epsilon^{rst}-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}m(\cot\theta+\tan\theta)=0\ ,\\
&-\Omega_{1,1\bar{1}}-2\Omega_{q,\bar{1}}{}^{q}+\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}m(\cot\theta-\tan\theta)=0\ .
\end{aligned}\tag{D.9}$$

These geometric conditions must also be supplemented with $d(e^{1}+e^{\bar{1}})=0$ which follows from (D.5). The above conditions can be re-expressed in terms of G_2 representations but their form above in terms of $SU(3)$ representations suffices.

References

[1] G. W. Gibbons and P. K. Townsend, "Vacuum interpolation in supergravity via super p-branes," Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 3754 [hep-th/9307049].

[2] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, "Large N field theories, string theory and gravity," Phys. Rept. **323** (2000) 183 [hep-th/9905111].

[3] W. Israel, "Event Horizons In Static Vacuum Space-Times," Phys. Rev. **164** (1967) 1776.

[4] B. Carter, "Axisymmetric Black Hole Has Only Two Degrees of Freedom," Phys. Rev. Lett. **26** (1971) 331.

[5] S. W. Hawking, "Black holes in general relativity," Commun. Math. Phys. **25** (1972) 152.

[6] D. C. Robinson, "Uniqueness of the Kerr black hole," Phys. Rev. Lett. **34** (1975) 905.

[7] W. Israel, "Event Horizons in Static, Electrovac Space-Times," Commun. Math. Phys. **8** (1968) 245.

[8] P. O. Mazur, "Proof of Uniqueness of the Kerr-Newman Black Hole Solution," J. Phys. A **15** (1982) 3173.

[9] D. Robinson, "Four decades of black hole uniqueness theorems," appeared in *The Kerr spacetime: Rotating black holes in General Relativity*, eds D. L. Wiltshire, M. Visser and S. M. Scott, pp 115-143, CUP 2009.

[10] G. W. Gibbons, D. Ida and T. Shiromizu, "Uniqueness and non-uniqueness of static black holes in higher dimensions", Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 041101; hep-th/0206049.

[11] M. Rogatko, "Uniqueness theorem of static degenerate and non-degenerate charged black holes in higher dimensions", Phys. Rev. **D67** (2003) 084025; hep-th/0302091; "Classification of static charged black holes in higher dimensions," Phys. Rev. **D73** (2006), 124027; hep-th/0606116.

[12] R. Emparan, T. Harmark, V. Niarchos and N. Obers, "World-Volume Effective Theory for Higher-Dimensional Black Holes," Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 191301; arXiv:0902.0427 [hep-th]; "Essentials of Blackfold Dynamics;" arXiv:0910.1601 [hep-th].

[13] J. Isenberg and V. Moncrief, *Symmetries of cosmological Cauchy horizons,* Commun. Math. Phys. **89** (1983) 387.

[14] H. Friedrich, I. Racz and R. M. Wald, *On the rigidity theorem for space-times with a stationary event horizon or a compact Cauchy horizon,* Commun. Math. Phys. **204** (1999) 691; gr-qc/9811021.

[15] H. S. Reall, *Higher dimensional black holes and supersymmetry*, Phys. Rev. **D68** (2003) 024024; hep-th/0211290.

[16] H. Elvang, R. Emparan, D. Mateos and H. S. Reall, "A Supersymmetric black ring," Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 211302 [hep-th/0407065].

[17] U. Gran, G. Papadopoulos and D. Roest, *Systematics of M-theory spinorial geometry,* Class. Quant. Grav. **22** (2005) 2701; hep-th/0503046.

[18] J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "Topology of supersymmetric N=1, D=4 supergravity horizons," JHEP **1011** (2010) 114 [arXiv:1006.4369 [hep-th]].

[19] M. Akyol and G. Papadopoulos, "Topology and geometry of 6-dimensional (1,0) supergravity black hole horizons," Class. Quant. Grav. **29** (2012) 055002 [arXiv:1109.4254 [hep-th]].

[20] J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "Heterotic Black Horizons," JHEP **1007** (2010) 011 [arXiv:0912.3472 [hep-th]].

J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "Heterotic horizons, Monge-Ampere equation and del Pezzo surfaces," JHEP **1010** (2010) 084 [arXiv:1003.2864 [hep-th]].

[21] J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "Static M-horizons," JHEP **1201** (2012) 005 [arXiv:1106.3085 [hep-th]].

[22] U. Gran, J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "IIB black hole horizons with five-form flux and KT geometry," JHEP **1105** (2011) 050 [arXiv:1101.1247 [hep-th]].

U. Gran, J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "IIB black hole horizons with five-form flux and extended supersymmetry," JHEP **1109** (2011) 047 [arXiv:1104.2908 [hep-th]].

[23] U. Gran, J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "Geometry of all supersymmetric four-dimensional N = 1 supergravity backgrounds," JHEP **0806** (2008) 102 [arXiv:0802.1779 [hep-th]].

[24] T. Ortin, "The Supersymmetric solutions and extensions of ungauged matter-coupled N=1, d=4 supergravity," JHEP **0805** (2008) 034 [arXiv:0802.1799 [hep-th]].

[25] M. Akyol and G. Papadopoulos, "Spinorial geometry and Killing spinor equations of 6-D supergravity," Class. Quant. Grav. **28** (2011) 105001 [arXiv:1010.2632 [hep-th]].

[26] U. Gran, P. Lohrmann and G. Papadopoulos, "The Spinorial geometry of supersymmetric heterotic string backgrounds," JHEP **0602** (2006) 063 [hep-th/0510176].

U. Gran, G. Papadopoulos, D. Roest and P. Sloane, "Geometry of all supersymmetric type I backgrounds," JHEP **0708** (2007) 074 [hep-th/0703143 [HEP-TH]].

[27] U. Gran, J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "The Spinorial geometry of supersymmetric IIb backgrounds," Class. Quant. Grav. **22** (2005) 2453 [hep-th/0501177].

U. Gran, J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "The G(2) spinorial geometry of supersymmetric IIB backgrounds," Class. Quant. Grav. **23** (2006) 143 [hep-th/0505074].

[28] J. P. Gauntlett and S. Pakis, "The Geometry of D = 11 killing spinors," JHEP **0304** (2003) 039 [hep-th/0212008].

J. P. Gauntlett, J. B. Gutowski and S. Pakis, "The Geometry of D = 11 null Killing spinors," JHEP **0312** (2003) 049 [hep-th/0311112].

[29] J. Gillard, U. Gran and G. Papadopoulos, "The Spinorial geometry of supersymmetric backgrounds," Class. Quant. Grav. **22** (2005) 1033 [hep-th/0410155].

[30] E. Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, "Supergravity Theory in Eleven-Dimensions," Phys. Lett. B **76** (1978) 409.

[31] C. J. Isham and C. N. Pope, "Nowhere Vanishing Spinors And Topological Obstructions To The Equivalence Of The Nsr And Gs Superstrings," Class. Quant. Grav. **5** (1988) 257.

[32] N. Kim and J. -D. Park, "Comments on AdS(2) solutions of D=11 supergravity," JHEP **0609** (2006) 041 [hep-th/0607093].

[33] J. M. Figueroa-O'Farrill and G. Papadopoulos, "Maximally supersymmetric solutions of ten-dimensional and eleven-dimensional supergravities," JHEP **0303** (2003) 048 [hep-th/0211089].

[34] U. Gran, J. Gutowski, G. Papadopoulos and D. Roest, "N=31, D=11," JHEP **0702** (2007) 043 [hep-th/0610331].

[35] U. Gran, J. Gutowski and G. Papadopoulos, "M-theory backgrounds with 30 Killing spinors are maximally supersymmetric," JHEP **1003** (2010) 112 [arXiv:1001.1103 [hep-th]].

[36] M. J. Duff, "M theory on manifolds of G(2) holonomy: The First twenty years," hep-th/0201062.